GGBTS LIBRARY - MILL VALLEY
3 0001 00073 6589

IR30.9
L770r

43760

Llewellin

Reformers and the reformation

R30.9
770r

43760

lewellin

eformers and the reformation

27611

Reformers and the Reformation

redwick lodge

— BY THE —

Rev. F. G. LLEWELLIN, B.D. (Durham)

Vicar of Clodock, Abergavenny.

HEREFORD :
JAKEMAN AND CARVER, HIGH TOWN.
1921

Library
Oakland S.U.M

IR 30.9
L 770N

By the Same Author

LECTURES ON SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHING.
CHRIST'S CONFESSOR AT BRENTWOOD.
ST. CLODOCK ; BRITISH KING AND MARTYR—
A HISTORY OF THE WELSH BORDERLAND.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
CHAPTER I.	
WAS THE REFORMATION REALLY NECESSARY?	1
CHAPTER II.	
MARTIN LUTHER:—HIS LIFE, TIMES, TEACHING AND CONTRIBUTION TO THE REFORMATION, 1483–1546	22
CHAPTER III.	
JOHN CALVIN:— DITTO. 1509–1564	65
CHAPTER IV.	
WILLIAM TYNDALE (MARTYR) DITTO 1484–1536	118
CHAPTER V.	
ARCHBISHOP THOMAS CRANMER (MARTYR) DITTO. 1489–1556	142
CHAPTER VI.	
BISHOP JEWEL:— DITTO. 1522–1571	198
CHAPTER VII.	
INHERITORS AND GUARDIANS ARE WE ..	227
APPENDIX A. "THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE"	113
APPENDIX B. "THE INQUISITION" ..	115
INDEX.	244

PREFACE.

A brief explanation of the object and sources of this book seems to be both desirable and necessary. There are to-day many large and learned volumes on the Reformation, but few persons will admit that they can find time to read hundreds of pages. This is distinctly unfortunate, because there is always the danger of accepting partial views and scrappy information from little books. However, facts and circumstances have to be faced, and the *multum in parvo* type of book can prove itself a help if it supplies readers with correct digests of facts, and guides to fuller information in more pretentious volumes.

The Clergy, Bible-Class and Sunday-School Teachers, and the business-man who is interested in Church affairs, all these, or nearly all, want concise statements of facts on which to base their own opinions.

It is earnestly hoped that this large and intelligent circle of the Church public may, in these busy days, find time to read this comparatively short account of a movement which profoundly altered the ecclesiastical and civil history of our Country.

Believing that every Britisher should possess "a working-knowledge" of this great subject, we have endeavoured to tell the life-story of five leaders of the Reformation movement: to show how they came to hold their "new opinions," how they worked and suffered to

maintain the truth and to purify the Church of CHRIST.

We are all either for or against the Reformation as we read the tragic story. In writing the following pages we have been guided by the deep conviction that a straightforward narrative of the facts will demonstrate the truth that the Reformation was on the whole a great Divine blessing to the Nations which embraced it.

To answer the question "What leading views were held by the men who guided the movement?" we have gone to the "Primary Works" of five leaders, and have endeavoured to permit them to speak for themselves. We solicit a patient hearing for them, and have endeavoured to be quite unbiassed in stating the case from their point of view.

* * * * *

As to the sources of our information, the reader will observe an abundance of references throughout our pages. These are purposely supplied to enable readers to pursue the study of any given question. It has been very difficult to curtail the story, but brevity was necessary and all the salient points had to be touched on. Thanks are given to all the Authors from whose works we have quoted, but we should be lacking in courtesy if we omitted to mention those to whom we are particularly indebted viz.

Dr. B. J. Kidd "Documents of the Continental Reformation," also "History" of the same: Dean Wace "Luther's Primary Works" and "Principles of the Reformation": Dean Gee "Reformation Period" and "Elizabethan

Prayer-Book" : Gee and Hardy "Documents illustrative of English Church History" : Archdeacon Taylor "Lectures on the English Reformation," "Book of Bertram on the LORD'S Supper" : Mr. Henry Beveridge's "Translation of Calvin's Institutes" : The Parker Societies excellent volumes on Tyndale, Ridley, Cranmer, Jewel, etc., etc. : Drs. H. Y. Reyburn, and F. Bungener "Life of Calvin" : Mr. A. D. Innes "Cranmer" : Beza's "Icones" : Rev. R. Demaus "Tyndale" and "Latimer" : various "Dictionaries," Protestant and Roman Catholic : also Canon Harford's "Prayer-Book Dictionary," and the well known "English Church Teaching" by Bishop Drury and others. As to the "General history of the Reformation," we have drawn largely on Prof. T. M. Lindsay, Drs. L. von Ranke, J. Morrison, K. R. Hagenbach, K. von Hase, D'Aubigne, G. P. Fisher, F. Seebohm and Philip Schaff. On "Episcopacy and the Ministry" we have used Archbishop Bernard Dr. A. C. Headlam, etc. On "The Bible," Drs. R. Sinker and W. Muir, "Cambridge Greek Texts" and Mr. H. W. Hoare.

The above, and many other, Authorities were requisitioned and, we trust, fairly quoted, as may be seen by reference.

Thanks are tendered to Rev. H. Astbury, Vicar of Crasswall, for kindly reading through the MS. and making valuable suggestions.

CLODOCK VICARAGE,
CHRISTMAS, 1920.

I.

Was the Reformation really necessary?

THE REFORMATION period was one of the most remarkable epochs in our history, whether considered in relation to politics or religion. Its influence was most powerful upon both, and affected the Church and the State, and every rank and grade of society.

A few decades ago the vast majority of English men if asked "Do you think the Reformation was a blessing?" would have replied with a definite affirmative. To-day, the situation is entirely different: in reply to the above question many, otherwise well-educated, persons will confess to the scantiest knowledge, while some even admit blank ignorance, declaring "We don't know what you mean by the Reformation—what was it?" To such, this book may prove helpful if granted a fair reception and a little diligent thought. We blame no one for ignorance of the subject; the clergy do not preach about it often to-day and the laity naturally fall into a state of ignorance for want of simple and direct teaching.

But there are others who have been brought up in the "Counter-Reformation" school and who have been sedulously trained in the belief that, in the sixteenth century, a great ecclesiastical revolution took place, started by Martin Luther and eventually supported by Henry VIII;

both working from sordid, ulterior motives. These men, and their conscienceless helpers, succeeded in breaking the unity and peace of the mediæval church, and all our troubles in church affairs since that period, have sprung from the fearful and treacherous actions of these persons, who quite failed to appreciate the beauty and order of the Catholic Church, of which his Holiness the Pope of Rome is the true, lawful and only head on earth.

Now, it is incomprehensible to most persons of ordinary intelligence, that a Reformation movement, which friends and foes admit to have had the most far-reaching consequences, could have had no real and, indeed, adequate cause. A new school of theologians and historians, however, has arisen within the last eighty years and grown bolder in their assertions as time has gone by. To-day, they tell us plainly that there should not have been any radical changes in the church of three and a half centuries ago. Matters, doubtless, were not quite what they should have been, but, given a fair chance, the church would have set her house in order and the beautiful unity of old days would have been gloriously maintained until this very hour. There were the Popes—so we are now assured—striving for peace, purity and goodwill: but what could the "Vicar of CHRIST on earth" do against the attacks of men who wanted unlawful wives or who cared for nothing so much as to destroy all things that were ancient and beautiful? The Reformation is an historical fact; of that there is no dispute. *Was it a necessity and would we not have been much better without it?* The question is perfectly

plain and can be answered either " Yes" or " No" but we cannot answer " Yes " and " No ".

The following points will serve to illustrate the fact that the Reformation was an absolute necessity in the church life of the period, and will also clearly show that the causes of that great movement were numerous and varied. Not only were there flagrant abuses to be set right, but an entirely new situation was arising which demanded, with clamant voice, a virile, living church which should aid its people and not retard all spiritual and moral, personal and national advancements.

(*a*) Let us observe the Papacy itself: what an inglorious picture it presents! Quarrels in any professing church of CHRIST are deplorable, but here we have the self-asserted " mistress of all the churches of Christendom " with three of her leading ecclesiastics fighting for the office of Pope, each claiming the Title and each excommunicating the others. Such was the case, for example, during the year 1409–1414, when the rival Popes were Gregory XII : Benedict XIII, and John XXIII ; though the conflict usually known as the " Western Schism " commenced in 1378 with the death of Gregory XI. Fortunately we need not go into the sordid problem, but we are bound to make a special note of the leading character of the three abovementioned popes, viz., John XXIII. That such a man could ever have been placed at the head of the ancient church of Rome speaks volumes. In 1409 the Council of Pisa met to settle the great dispute with which all Europe was ringing. Gregory XII., and (anti-Pope)

Clement VII. were both deposed as "schismatical heretics and perjurers" and excommunicated (The latter, however, was succeeded by Benedict XIII) and in their place the Council elected Alexander V, a feeble old man who shortly succumbed, and was succeeded in office by John XXIII. The quarrel of the rival popes continued until 1414, when the Emperor Sigismund compelled John to call another "reforming council" which was to be held at Constance with a definite threefold object, viz., To heal the schism in the papacy and compel all to submit to one Pope; to effect a reformation both in the Head and members of the church; and to suppress heresy. And what happened? The Council declared itself above Popes and deposed all three claimants. As for the reigning Pope, John XXIII, he had to stand at the bar of justice and answer for his unspeakable crimes! Professor J. C. Robertson gives a full account of the trial of John and the items of the charges include simony, gross maladministration as legate, adultery, sodomy, denial of leading Christian doctrines (*e.g.* the resurrection of the dead and eternal life), etc. The evidence was considered to be so strong that his deposition was resolved on, as being guilty of simony and scandalous life. His seal was broken and he was sentenced to imprisonment for life. Remaining in prison at Heidelberg, he eventually purchased a ransom for himself and became Cardinal-bishop of Tusculum (Frascati), but he died without taking possession of his See.[1] Nor was John XXIII,

1. "History of Christian Church," Vol. VII, pp. 362-68: also Mosheim's "History," Part II, pp. 527–30.

the only monster of iniquity who occupied the position of pope. We quote one other specimen case, that of Alexander VI, (1492–1503). We observe that this head of a celibate clergy had a ' natural son,' whose name was Cæsar Borgia, who murdered his own brother and brother-in-law, and gave opponents to understand that they would be similarly dealt with if they obstructed him in any way. " The kindred of the Popes " says Ranke " have often distinguished themselves in the career of evil, but none attained to the eminence of Cæsar Borgia. He may be called a virtuoso in crime."[1] The father, Pope Alexander VI, died through a mistake, A confection, with poison placed in it, by the Pope's specific orders, for one of the Cardinals, was set before the Pontiff himself and " Alexander VI, expired from the effects of the poison he had destined for another."[2] That such persons could have been tolerated even for a moment, will be regarded by many as a clear proof of the need of a Reformation ; but we merely quote John XXIII, and Alexander VI, as one branch of the evidence that reform of the most drastic character could not long be delayed.

The Reformation was merely a crisis to which things had been tending for 300 years previously ; let us proceed to other and varied evidences for our stated conviction.

(*b*) The Church and the question of Heresy, also furnishes a vivid illustration of the distance travelled, by 1414, from the mind and teach-

1. Ranke's " History of the Popes," Vol. I, p. 38.
2. *ibid.* p. 39 *et seq.*

ing of our Lord. While Pope John XXIII, deposed for his fearfully evil deeds, was allowed a little later to show his face in office as Cardinal bishop, what happened to men whose doctrine was divergent from prevalent ideas? Were such leniently treated, or even liberated after a short imprisonment? Let us observe three examples of the period: in 1414, Huss and Jerome of Prague, both renowned saints and scholars, were burnt at the stake; while somewhat later the bones of Wickliffe were exhumed, burnt to ashes and cast into the river. And this was the conduct of a church which, on the testimony of *all* the Reformers, though we quote Bishop Jewel as our special witness, was winking at fornication and accepting pensions in the city of Rome out of evil living.[1] The so-called 'reforming Councils' could do nothing but forbid the Cup to the laity and pursue "heresy," with closed eyes as to rampant immoralities. Was this the mind of CHRIST?

Superficial critics may say "Why quote Rome's burnings when both sides burnt opponents impartially: think of Calvin burning Servetus?" We answer "It is not true that Protestants ever persecuted as Rome consistently and persistently did. We reserve detailed discussion (see the end of Ch. III.), but may point out that the principle is not the same in both cases. Protestants made a few bad mistakes and have publicly repented as in the case of Servetus. Perse-

1. "Apology," Parker Society, Vol. III, pp. 72–73; see also Calvin's "Institutes" Vol. II, pp. 339–352, and Bishop Ridley's "Works" p. 55.

cution is clean contrary to Protestant Christianity ; but in the case of Rome the opposite is true. Her " mistakes " were by the thousand : let those who can, quote Rome's repentance. In 1862, the Archbishop of Toulouse proclaimed a public festival in pious memory of the prelude to the massacre of St. Bartholomew (24th August, 1572), the murder of 1,000 Hugenots on 16th May, 1562, in Toulouse, after they had laid down their arms on receiving an assurance that they would be permitted to depart unmolested. This " festival " had been held in 1662 and 1762, but in 1862 the French Government forbade so disgraceful a celebration.[1] Rome, in Queen Mary's days, burned our Archbishop of Canterbury and four English bishops. Has there ever been a word of repentance on her part ? Never : Simply because in burning heretics she is following her well-known principles ; but they are not Christian principles or practices.

(*c*) The need of drastic reform is also abundantly illustrated in the case of Indulgences. For the moment it will suffice to say that, roughly speaking, Indulgences were pardons for sin. These in the course of time came to be sold and brought an immense amount of money into the papal exchequer, particularly in the 15th and 16th centuries. (See Ch. II. *re* Luther's attack on this evil system). Instead of quoting the Reformers, we take two testimonies, from Roman Catholic writers of acknowledged authority.

1. See Karl von Hase " Handbook to the Controversy with Rome," Vol. I, pp. 77–83 ; Trans. by the Rev. Dr. A. W. Streane, Cambridge.

The Rev. J. Waterworth, S. J. in his standard work, " the " History of the Council of Trent : its Canons and Decrees " admits that " the evils complained of must be encountered and a searching remedy applied to the abuses that had crept into ecclesiastical government, to the *rank vices* that had been engendered by ages of civil wars, and to that licence and confusion which a convulsed state of society created in the discipline of the outward character of the Church." He admits the evil of the sale of indulgences by Pope Julius II, and Leo X, the cupidity and mismanagement of the agents employed, and informs us that Pope Adrian VI, said his first endeavour should be " to bring about a Reformation in the court and tribunals of Rome, and that the present troubles are a just punishment from God upon the sins of the clergy and the people : that it was no wonder the evil had spread from the head to the members ; but that he would do his best to apply remedies suitable to the occasion."[1]

We turn now to the latest scholarship of the Church of Rome, viz., " The Catholic Encyclopedia," where a lengthy and spicy (!) article on " Martin Luther " occupies some 20 large pages[2]. The Rev. H. G. Ganss in that article admits, quite frankly, that a most undesirable state of affairs was operating regarding Indulgences. He criticises Archbishop Albert of Brandenburg, Luther's archbishop and opponent in 1518, in this connection thus :—" Albert of Brandenburg was heavily involved in debt . . . . to pay

1. Chap. I, section VIII. 2. Vol. IX, pp. 438–58.

a bribe to an unknown agent in Rome to buy off a rival, in order that the archbishop might enjoy a plurality of ecclesiastical offices. For this payment, which smacked of simony . . . the Pope would allow an indemnity which in this case took the form of an indulgence . . . By this ignoble business arrangement with Rome, a financial transaction unworthy of both pope and archbishop, the revenue should be partitioned in equal halves to each, beside a bonus of 10,000 gold ducats which should fall to the share of Rome." The writer admits, with some lame apologies, " It is not to be denied . . . . that a doctrine like that of indulgences . . . led to abuse and scandal . . . . Cardinal Ximenes prohibited them in Spain."[1] How strange, therefore, it is to read the most recent attacks on the Reformation—by Anglican Clergymen—proceeding on the line that there was in Reformation days, nothing to reform !

(*d*) Let us now turn to the question of the abuse of Patronage. The witness of the Reformers is unanimous in this matter, though Calvin's testimony, in the " Institutes " Book IV, ch. V, is perhaps, the most scathing of attacks on Church abuses ever written ; and Calvin's truthfulness and sincerity are universally admitted even by those who detest his name. If Calvin's testimony is to be accepted, there can be no more argument about the need of a thorough Reformation. But look at the plainest facts of the case

1. *Ibid.* Vol. IX, p. 442, and compare Leopold von Ranke's " Reformation " pp. 149–156 and 515, also B. J. Kidd's " Documents of the Continental Reformation " p. 12–17.

in England alone (though our country was not by any means in the worst case) ; in Henry III's time the Pope claimed the revenues of all vacant benefices, a twentieth of all Ecclesiastical revenues and a third of all above one hundred marks —and a half from all non-residents and the right to appoint to all Bishoprics, Abbeys and large benefices " The Italian clergy in England had 60,000 marks a year ; more than the entire revenues of the Crown ; while Mansel, the King's Chaplain, is said to have held 700 livings."[1]

There had been much strife in England since the time of Bishop Grosseteste (1247) and we find the battle raging in 1351, hence the passing of the First Statute of Provisors to defend the rights of English Church patronage as against Rome's arrogant claims. In 1390, the Anglican position was strengthened by a second Act which complained of Papal exactions and demanded freedom from the Pope of all elections to various offices.[2] The appointment of children to Church positions was an evident scandal. It was possibly worse on the Continent than in England. The learned Felix Bungener remarks " Calvin was appointed a Chaplain at 12 years of age . . . . In France there was to be seen a Cardinal at 16, Odet de Châtillon. In Portugal there was one at 12 years old and Leo X, who nominated him, had himself been created Archbishop of Aix at five years of age ! "[3]

1. Archdeacon W. F. Taylor " Reformation " p. 5.
2. Gee and Hardy " Documents " pp. 112–121.
3. " Life of Calvin " p. 7.

Bishop Swinfield of Hereford (1283–1316) refused to institute a boy of 16 years, named Baskerville, to the Vicarage of Weobley on the presentation of the Prior and Canons of Llanthony.[1] A few other illustrations of courageous action by individual English bishops could also be quoted : these were exceptions to the rule.

Did the Church attempt to remedy such evils ? Yes : quite without success worthy of the name. The furthest point reached was the formation of Committees and a lot of talk about the difficult problem.

The Councils of Pisa, Constance and Basle deliberated in the early years of the 15th century, and when at last the Reformation had come from without, Rome, for shame's sake, moved somewhat at the Council of Trent (1564). Pope Adrian VI, (1522–23), as Dr. von Ranke reminds us,[2] made an honest attempt at reform, though, even with that good pope, attacks on heresy had the preference over putting the Roman church in order. He declared that he " had only bent his neck under the yoke of the papal dignity, in order to restore the defiled bride of CHRIST to her original purity." When, however, the Diet of Nurnberg (1523), by no means a Protestant assembly, asked for reforms and reaffirmed the grievances of Germany in their *Centum Gravamina* (a hundred charges or complaints), poor Pope Adrian VI, collapsed under

1. Dr. Cutts " Parish Priests and their people in the Middle Ages," pp. 319–333.

2. Von Ranke's " Reformation " Book III, p. 270–71 and 317–321 ; also " Popes " Vol. I, p. 72–75 where Adrian gets full credit for a plucky fight against overwhelming odds.

the strain of an intolerable and impossible position.[1] Rome would not reform and the chief reason was *she could not*, so deeply had she committed herself in previous generations to a non-moral policy. Need more be said? Yet our new historians tell us that there was nothing requiring reform—the culprits were, not the Papacy, but the Reformers!

(*e*) Another crying scandal of mediæval times was the Monastic system. We have elsewhere shewn that in much earlier days it did good work,[2] but those days had now gone by, and in his classical "Life and Letters of Erasmus," Professor J. A. Froude remarks "The kidnapping of boys and girls who had either money or rank or talent, was a common method of recruiting among the religious orders in the 15th century. It is alluded to and sharply condemned by a statute of Henry IV, passed by an English Parliament . . . . Erasmus had something of this kind of experience . . . and despite ill-treatment and short food at home, would have none of the monastery."[3] The famous "Praise of Folly" from the brilliant pen of Erasmus, with its delicate, yet powerful, satire on current abuses, was no more acceptable to Rome than Luther's withering attack.[4] Both were equally condemned by the Inquisition, and

1. Dr. B. J. Kidd, "Continental Reformation" p. 34.
2. "St. Clodock" chap. III, "Monks of the Welsh borderland."
3. pp. 6–9.
4. Luther's "Primary Works," Wace and Buchheim, p. 190 *st seq.* Luther suggests that no one under 30 years of age should be permitted to take monastic vows.

let our "Counter Reformation" friends remember, that the condemnation extended not only to the "Praise of Folly" but to the "Paraphrase of the New Testament."[1] The latter, we may inform some and remind others, was merely a running comment, of a very fair and useful kind, on the Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul.

Erasmus was thus strongly against the existing monastic system for the most practical reasons, and his testimony is borne by various writers of the period.[2] Burnet informs us that "many had taken their vows under compulsion, or at an early age, and now pleaded to be set at liberty."[3] Surely reform was long overdue at this point!

(*f*) The interference on the part of the Papacy with the rights of Nations and Churches also called for reform. On this point we may quote a highly competent scholar, and ex-Roman priest the Rev. Arthur Galton, M.A., Oxon.; sometime chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon. In his excellent book "Our attitude towards English Roman Catholics and the Papal Court" speaking of "the incompatibility between Roman and English principles, between the Papacy and freedom" the author proceeds "As we examine the past, we find the Papacy at every stage of our progress, in conflict with our liberties and the whole spirit of our institutions. It was allied with the Norman Conqueror; and we may resent the alli-

1. L. von Ranke "Hist. Ref." Book V. p. 538.
2. See also K. R. Hagenbach's "Reformation," Vol. I, pp. 61–64.
3. "History of the Reformation," Vol. I, p. 249.

ance, although the Conquest proved itself a blessing in disguise.

The Pope supported John and Henry III, and Mary Tudor and Charles I, and James II. He had opposed Henry II, and the Reformation and Queen Elizabeth and Cromwell and William III. That is to say, he supported every cause and person which has been opposed to the growth and development of our Constitution or of our greatness. He has opposed every cause and principle which we regard as having helped us to be what we are."[1]

As another instance of Papal interference we may quote the Second Act of Præmunire (1393), in which Parliament complains that "the Pope was contemplating moving English Bishops without their consent or the consent of theKing."[2] Space forbids further illustrations of the civic or political positions: we turn to the need of doctrinal reforms within the Church.

Equally important and insistent was the need of doctrinal reform in the visible church. Under five or six headings we can show that the Reformation was absolutely necessary.

(*a*) THE CLOSED BIBLE.—The Bible was not in the hands of the people: it was not an open book. Copies of it were few and costly and had it been made accessible in the mother-tongue, the clergy would have discouraged the general reading of it. The Church filled up the place where the Bible should have been. "In the early "Horn-books" and "Primers" small

1. pp. 144–5.
2. Gee and Hardy's "Documents" p. 123.

portions of the Bible were placed in the hands of the people ; but its treasures were to be tasted and enjoyed only as doled out by the authority of the Church."[1] The learned Provost Salmon of Trinity College, Dublin, has shown how fully the Holy Scriptures were in use in the church of the early Fathers and what those learned men taught about the Bible as the " Rule of Faith."[2] Judged by such standards, Rome had departed far from the best ancient practices. For the moment we chiefly note the loss to both Clergy and People that an almost unknown Bible may be regarded to have been. The people all unconsciously were starving for want of the living bread. An open and studied Bible was the beginning of the end of Roman power in the Middle Ages. Luther was 20 years of age when he was charmed to discover a whole Latin Bible in the Erfurt Monastery : the story is exquisitely related by Dr. D'Aubigne in his " History of the Reformation."[3] Who would vote to-day for a closed Bible ? Who would have darkness rather than sunshine ? " I know not," says one of the most competent scholars of recent times, " whether any man of sound understanding, any man not led astray by some phantasm, can seriously wish that this state of things had remained unshaken and unchanged in Europe . . . . In the ages in which the scholastic dogmas were fixed, the Bible was

1. Bishop Drury " Reformation " p. 17.
2. Infallibility of the Church, pp. 117–22 and 142–6. *See also* Dean Goode's " Divine Rule of Faith," chap. vii.
3 Chap ii, p. 43.

forbidden to the laity altogether and even to the Priesthood in the mother tongue . . . . We must not confound the tendencies of the period now before us, with those evinced in the doctrines and practices established at the Council of Trent ; at that time even the party which adhered to (Roman) Catholicism had felt the influence of the epoch of the Reformation, and had begun to reform itself ; the current was already arrested."[1] In a word the Bible, with its freedom of access as we have it to-day, did not exist for the people, and the clergy, who, for the most part, made no pretence to systematic study, had only Latin versions. Who will assert that the change from a closed Bible to an open one was not desirable ?[2]

(*b*) The sacrifice of the *Mass* occupied the place of the *Coena Domini* ; the Lord's Supper. Now the Mass was a superstructure on the foundation of the ninth century doctrine of " Transubstantiation " (see chap. v.) ; but with an open Bible and freedom to read it, this dogma gave way and the superstructure almost completely fell. Our Church plainly declares that Transubstantiation (the change of the substance of Bread and Wine at the Holy Communion Service) is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthrows the nature of a Sacrament, and has given rise to many superstitions (Art. 28). The Mass also is described (Art. 31) as a blasphemous fable, because it suggests that our LORD'S sacrifice on Calvary was incomplete.

1 Von Ranke's " Hist. Reformation," book ii, p. 266–7.
2 See Dr. Wm. Muir's book " Our Grand old Bible " chap. iii.

Dr. Newman, supported by Dr. Pusey, advanced the view, in "Tract 90," that it is not "the Mass" which is condemned in Article XXXI, but the "Sacrifices of masses" which, according to the 'modern' view, had developed into a kind of merchandise in sacred things.[1] This line of argument will not stand the test, for in Archbishop Cranmer's greatest book, "for which he stood to the fire and died a martyr's death," he says "The greatest blasphemy and injury that can be against CHRIST and yet universally used throughout the popish kingdom, is this, that the priests make their mass a sacrifice propitiatory, to remit their sins as well of themselves as of other, both quick and dead."[2] To the same effect could be quoted, Tyndale, Ridley, Jewel, etc. Thus did our church fall back on New Testament simplicity in doctrine and practice; we abolished the Mass and substituted the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion.

(*c*) THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE LAITY was a Reformation doctrine only in the sense that it was a rediscovery of primitive teaching, as Bishop Lightfoot demonstrated, some few years ago, in his scholarly essay on the subject. Instead of being spectators, the people were now to be worshippers: instead of the priest as mediator, the new (yet old) doctrine was that of direct

1 Dr. Kidd's "XXXIX Articles," p. 254, and Mr. Spencer-Jones "Counter Reformation" ch. ii, has the same ideas less carefully stated.

2 "The Lord's Supper" p. 232, *see* also "Works" Vol. 1, p. 374 and the "Homily for Whit-Sunday" . . . "the Lord's Supper is a Sacrament: they have changed it into a sacrifice." *See* the Consecration prayer in the Holy Communion Service on the perfection of Christ's sacrifice.

access to the Throne of Grace for each and every believer in CHRIST and the people were led in worship by the minister. As Archdeacon Taylor has reminded us "The word which means a sacrificing priest and which is applied to the Jewish and Pagan Priests in the New Testament, is never once applied to Christian Ministers, though some ten other titles of office are given to them.[1] Let any one read St. Paul's Epistles to Timothy and Titus, and then say which is the truer expression of the Christian Ministry, that of England or Rome!

(*d*) JUSTIFICATION THROUGH THE GRACE OF CHRIST BY FAITH was reinstated at the Reformation. Dr. B. J. Kidd, who has given students of these questions such invaluable help in his learned books, to which we shall later make the fullest reference, seems to be unfair to the Reformation when he remarks: "The new foundation of doctrine was simply the believer's justification by faith only."[2] and again a similar, though more extended statement is made nine pages later. Dr. Kidd will feel honoured if, instead of giving our own opinion, we turn for a statement of the exact point to a ripe scholar to whom the whole church is indebted, viz., Dr. Philip Schaff who says, "Justification by the sole merits of CHRIST as apprehended by faith, without works of our own, which are indeed necessary as fruits or evidences, but *not as conditions of justification*:—This is a fundamental doctrine of the Evangelical Creed."[3]

1 "Reformation Lectures" p. 70.
2 "Continental Reformation" pp. 107 and 116.
3 Lectures on "Christ and Christianity" p. 143.

There was no point made clearer by Luther, Calvin and Jewel than this : That the Reformation did not stand for a " Justification by faith " in the sense that one had merely to believe in a casual way concerning CHRIST, and then lead what kind of evil life one chose. This is demonstrated by the Dean of Canterbury's translation of Luther's " Primary Works."[1]

Under this heading we may mention the abolition of Confession to the Priest, which was substituted for the more scriptural, direct confession to God and the reminder of I. St. John I, 8–9, " If we say that we have no Sin, etc."—with which should be carefully noted the precise wording of the Absolution.

The Reformation honoured CHRIST by taking Him at His word and pointing sinners to salvation by faith in His all-sufficient sacrifice for us. No truth had been more covered with *debris* in pre-Reformation days than this, and none was now more brilliantly revealed. " The Reformation is JESUS CHRIST : O King of glory ! we desire but Thee alone."[2]

(*e*) In the matter of *Preaching and Catechising*, " there was scarcely any of the former and in the present day sense (for we have an excellent Catechism in our Prayer Book) there was none of the latter."[3] Bishop Hugh Latimer tells us

1 " Concerning Christian Liberty, pp. 277–80, 282, 287–88. For further reference to the subject see the end of chapter ii, in this volume.

2 Dr. D'Aubigne's " Preface " p. 5.

3 Rev. J. J. Blunt " Reformation " p. 67.

that " though mass was on no account left unsaid for a single Sunday, sermons might be omitted for twenty Sundays and nobody be blamed." The unpreaching prelate is honest Latimer's byword, and Calvin, as well as Jewel, pointedly asks how the Pope can possibly be the successor of St. Peter, if he never preaches ? The Reformers, Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer respectively, produced the most magnificent catechisms. Here again was a huge gain : are we to prefer a sleepy, almost dead church to a living one that is grappling with the work that lies before it ? The mediæval church was engaged, for the most part, doing anything that did not matter and failed to realise how far she had departed from CHRIST'S teaching as found in the Bible.

* * * * *

With these ideas in mind ; the urgency of immediate, drastic reform and the hopelessness of the situation, since Rome " the Mistress of all the Churches " partly would not change for the better and partly could not, let us approach the story of five of the leading Reformers and see what we may learn from them as eye-witnesses of the great events. These men were not arm-chair critics ; they were soldiers of CHRIST fighting a fearful battle. All five were declared ' heretics ' and two of them died a martyr's death, while the other three were most providentially spared for greater work. Let us remember that all five were zealous Romanist Churchmen

1 Latimer's " Sermons " vol. i, p. 282 and ii, p. 243, etc. also Demaus' " Life of Latimer " pp. 80 and 406.

until they studied the Bible, and they found that "unless we left Rome, we could not come to CHRIST"—as Bishop Jewel says in the famous "Apology."

One other word: in 1453 the Turks sacked Constantinople and Greek scholars came to Florence and Padua as well as Paris, Basle, and Cambridge. Copernicus had enlarged and corrected men's notions of the material universe. "Columbus had discovered another hemisphere although the Inquisition had proved it could not exist."[1] Printing was now available; books were produced by the thousands. The Reformers were men with a vision of a purified Church. They possibly made a few mistakes, for they were not infallible. It was necessary that something should be done—they did it, and did it well.

1 Rev. A. Galton, p. 43.

II.

Martin Luther, (1483—1546).

GERMANY.

THIS famous Reformer was born on the 10th of November, 1483, in the little town of Eisleben, Saxony, of poor but respectable, industrious parents. Luther tells us that his parents were very poor. "My Father" he says "was a woodcutter and my Mother has often carried the wood on her back that she might earn wherewith to bring us children up. They endured the hardest labours for our sake." Contrary to present day ideas, the belief in those days was "spare the rod and spoil the child." Luther was drilled severely at home, but his father strove to give the youthful Martin a training in the ways of godliness and an opportunity for a better education than labourers' sons at that time received. Martin, accordingly, at the age of fourteen years went to a Latin school at Magdeburg, probably conducted by those excellent men the "Brethren of the Common life" who did so much at that period towards the spread of personal piety and religious know-

ledge amongst the community at large.[1] The following year (1498) we find Luther at Eisenach and here, singing in the streets, he was befriended by the kind-hearted wife of Conrad Cotta, who was attracted and charmed by the young boy's rich alto voice. Begging scholars, both on the Continent and in England at this time, were very numerous: as were also specious imitation "scholars."

* * * * *

In 1501 Luther was able, chiefly owing to the liberality of his newly-found friend, to enter the University of Erfurt, taking his B.A. degree in 1502 and his M.A. three years later. Graduating in philosophy he would, at Erfurt, study Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas. He learned no Greek at Erfurt and perhaps it would be correct to say that he read the Latin authors for their subject-matter rather than for their style, though he was quite a good Latinist. In 1505 he became an Augustinian monk and a Priest at 24 years of age (1507). Luther's father hoped his son would become a distinguished lawyer, but to the former's great, though temporary, chagrin, Martin, as the result of a severe,

1. The founder of this Mystical Order was one Gerard Groot who did much for the religious education of the young The Brethren supported themselves by copying and selling manuscripts and soon began to receive the support of godly and influential people. Their largest and most successful school was conducted by Alexander Hegius at Deventer. It is interesting to note that one of the chief maxims of the Brethren was that "learning without piety is a curse rather than a blessing." Among the great men who received their education at the hands of the brethren were John Wessel, Erasmus and Luther. (See Lindsay "Reformation" Vol. I, pp. 50–51).

inward, spiritual struggle decided to be ordained, which ordination to the Priesthood took place on May 2nd, 1507. The following year he was appointed Professor of Philosophy in the new University of Wittenburg.

Of his devout life and self-sacrificing zeal there is no shadow of doubt and his depression while painfully seeking for the truth which makes men free, caused him to communicate his spiritual troubles to John Staupitz, Professor of Theology at Wittenberg and Vicar-General of the monastic order of which Luther was a distinguished member. The story of this good monk's reply to Luther in his soul's distress is beautifully and fully related in Dr. Merle D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation" (Vol. I, ch. iv.), but there is one passage we cannot forbear quoting: Luther had related the inward anguish of his soul and how he had resolved in vain to fight against sin. The Vicar-General understood the case of his young friend for he too had passed through the same painful discipline.

"Why," said he "do you distress yourself with these speculations. Look to the wounds of JESUS CHRIST and the blood which He has shed for you: there you will see the mercy of GOD. Instead of torturing yourself for your faults, cast yourself into the arms of your Redeemer . . Listen to the Son of God. He became man to assure you of the Divine favour. He says to you, "You are my sheep: you hear my voice: none shall pluck you out of my hand." Then followed the quotation of the never-to-be-forgotten St. John's Gospel ch. iii, v. 16. "God so loved the World that He gave His only-begot-

ten Son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting Life." And so the light of God's full and free salvation in JESUS CHRIST began to dawn on Luther's troubled soul. The words of the Apostles' Creed "I believe in the forgiveness of sins" were also emphasized by the kind-hearted and truly venerable Staupitz. "I believe this," said Luther, and his friend then pointed out the truth that many oft-times miss—"You must not only believe that David's or St. Peter's sins are forgiven: devils believe that. The command of God is that we believe our own sins are forgiven."

Realising the great truth of Justification by Faith in JESUS CHRIST, Luther from that moment found rest for his troubled spirit and rapidly recovered from the sickness into which this experience had brought him.

Doubtless Staupitz thought he had seen the conclusion of the matter, but the apparent end was the real beginning, for the doctrine of Justification by Faith in JESUS CHRIST was not merely different from the current teaching of the mediæval church, but diametrically opposed to it. The one told of salvation by faith in CHRIST, the other of salvation by so-called "good works" and the two ideas cannot exist side by side. Instead of teaching that God pardons sin "because of our good works and complete contrition" here was the old Scriptural doctrine revived, viz., That God accepts the truly repentant sinner for CHRIST'S sake and because of His finished and perfect sacrifice on our behalf. There are reasons for thinking that Luther scarcely

grasped the full significance of this newly-revived doctrine for some little time ; but further study of the Word convinced him mightily of the truth he had received and embraced.

He now studied the whole Bible as he had never done before, and also studied scholastic theology. The clergy at that time used parts of the sacred Scriptures, *e. g.* Psalms, Epistles and Gospels, but while there are advantages in thus having selected portions, experience clearly proves that there is a danger of forgetting other and equally helpful parts. Luther's discovery of a *whole* Latin Bible has been beautifully portrayed by D'Aubigne and his delight on exploring new and fresh treasures in both the Old and New Testament may be read elsewhere : considerations of space will not permit us to enlarge in these pages.

In 1509 Luther took his B.D. degree and three years later became a Doctor of Divinity. Before settling down to lecture on Theology, however, he was to have a further experience which should rouse in him the spirit of a Reformer, and fit him for the work to which, we cannot doubt, God specially called him. Probably sent by Vicar-General Staupitz on business for the Augustinian Order, Luther visited the city of Rome. He came, he tells us, with all the enthusiams and fervour of a religious zealot, but his heart sank within him when he discovered that the Rome of his visions, " that City of God," was the very opposite of godliness and Christian morality.[1] Shocked and disgusted, he returned

1. Rank " Popes ", Vol. I., p. 39, etc., and Hagenbach's " Reformation," Vol. I., 88–90.

but as yet he had no thought of leaving the Church of his fathers and on his return, during 1513–17, we find him lecturing at Wittenberg on the Psalms and the Pauline Epistles, Romans and Galatians. He also studied St. Augustine and was delighted to find that his own doctrines were confirmed by those of the great fifth-century Bishop of Hippo, the most quoted of the ancient church Fathers. A little book entitled "Theologica Germanica" dealing with spiritual religion also helped him greatly. As yet there was no immediate outward sign of the great movement known to us as the Reformation.

Let us take a hurried glance at Rome. About twelve months after Luther's return from that city, a new Pope was enthroned. He was a Medici and took the title Leo X (1513–22). Although a Humanist and interested in scholastic progress he did not hesitate to renew the Bull of Indulgence of his predecessor, Julius II, with the object of raising funds for the rebuilding of St. Peter's Church, Rome. "He did not venture to issue commissions for Spain, France or England."[1] Germany, however, he divided into three parts and one of these was "farmed out" to the youthful Albert, Archbishop of Mainz, who was also Archbishop of Magdeburg. This prelate, 24 years of age, employed a capable auctioneer and salesman, John Tetzel, a Dominican Friar and, shameful to relate, an excellent orator and no mean scholar. Tetzel set to work vigorously, and roused the whole neighbourhood with his "pardons hot from Rome" and gathered

1. Kidd, "Continental Reformation," p. 15.

his coins with busy fingers. But he went a step too far. He was unfortunate enough to rouse one man too many and that man's name was Dr. Martin Luther, Professor of Wittenberg University, a man whom the truth had now made free, and who possessed the courage of a lion and an eloquence that could move Kings. Fortunately there is no need to recount all Tetzel's statements, but we must illustrate the need of our Reformer's stirring protest, and the following will suffice to show the blasphemy of the indulgence-seller and the blind cupidity of human nature when untouched by the Grace of God. The learned historian, Seckendorf, tells us that Tetzel preached as follows :—

" Draw near and I will give you letters, duly sealed, by which even the sins you shall hereafter desire to commit shall all be forgiven you . . . . I would not exchange my privileges with St. Peter in heaven, for I have saved more souls with my indulgences than he with his sermons . . . . There is no sin so great that the indulgences cannot remit : only pay largely and it shall be forgiven him. Even repentance is not indispensable . . . The moment the money clinks against the bottom of the chest, the soul escapes from purgatory and flies free to heaven."[1]

Against this and similar " doctrinal teaching " the spirit and soul of Martin Luther arose. The proceedings from beginning to end were an insult to God and His Church, to religion and common morality. Such traffic must be stopped, but that task presented stupendous difficulties.

1. Quoted from Dr. J. Morrison "Reformation," p. 91.

No ordinary man would face it, and, apart from the Spirit of God, no victory could have been attained.

Luther's plan was threefold. As a Priest of the Church he refused absolution to persons coming to confession and presenting Tetzel's pardons for sin. Secondly, he preached a powerful sermon on "Indulgences and the Grace of God" and finally, he sent a specific and detailed protest to the Authorities of the Church in those parts.

The second of these lines of attack was the immediate occasion of the Reformation. Luther repeated his great sermon and drew up his famous Ninety-five Theses or doctrinal propositions, challenging any learned man in Germany to debate the subject of Indulgences, either in public discussion or by letters. He also sent a copy of the Theses to Albert, Archbishop of Mainz, but, to his profound astonishment, this prelate refused to take Luther's side and the latter had to learn the sad lesson that self-interest can triumph over all appeals to reason, scripture and common sense. The Archbishop was finding the new merchandise far too profitable to be surrendered and instead of rising to the height of a noble opportunity, he chose rather to attack the man who dared to assert that salvation is a free gift of God "without money and without price."

Meanwhile, the intrepid Monk had launched what proved for the Papacy a devastating thunderbolt: the 95 Theses in Latin and German were nailed to the University Church door, and the printing-press (scarcely seventy years old

yet) did the rest. Luther's attack on Indulgences roused all Germany and without fully knowing it, he had placed a lever under Papal (not Catholic, mark you!)doctrines which was to overthrow the power of the Papacy. This was on October 31st, 1517.

During the following year he preached a course of helpful sermons on the Ten Commandments, demanding that the people should be taught the Will of God by the Word of God. People everywhere wondered what would happen to the popular leader against church abuses and they had not long to wait. In August, 1518, Dr. Luther was cited to appear at Rome, but, remembering the conduct of the papal power and the martyrdom of the brave Bohemian, John Huss, in the year 1415, Luther's warm -hearted friend and influential protector, the Elector Frederick of Saxony, demanded a "trial" within the boundaries of his territory. Thus did our reformer appear at Augsburg three successive days, October 12–14 in the year 1518 before the Italian Cardinal Cajetan. This ecclesiast declared that "the Catholic Church is the bond-slave of the Pope" and that the Papal Bull "Unigenitus" published by Clement VI, in 1343, asserting the Roman theory of the Church's possession of a great "Treasury of Merits" was a truth to be accepted and respected by all men everywhere.

To this assertion Luther gave a characteristically courageous reply and asserted *inter alia* that (*a*) Holy Scripture is an authority superior to Popes and, (*b*) That Justification by Faith in CHRIST is a necessary doctrine. He was a

fortunate man to escape with his life and he departed ready to appeal, as he himself put it, "from the Pope badly informed to the Pope to be better informed."[1] Meanwhile, throughout the year 1519 discussion raged in all Saxony, and in July, Luther found himself drawn into debate with a celebrated Roman theologian (who also, like the Reformer, was the son of a peasant), Professor John Eck of Ingolstadt, the subject of the discussion being the "Supremacy of the Pope." At the conclusion of this debate Dr. Eck proceeded to Rome to procure Luther's condemnation and a Bull was issued giving the latter sixty days in which to recant. No such idea was present in Luther's mind and on Dec. 10th he publicly burnt the document of excommunication, from which moment he went in danger of his life.

We pass rapidly over the exciting weeks and find ourselves in the town of Worms, the whole countryside being stirred with anxious interest. Men, from the good Elector of Saxony to the poorest peasant, trembled for Luther. The murder of John Huss, after a Roman promise of safe conduct, was all too well remembered. The Reformer's courage, based as it was on his confidence in God, did not forsake him for a moment and he soon found he had the support of large crowds of people who were tired of Roman corruption and irreligion. Elsewhere may be read the detailed story of Luther's bold stand for the truth: we must content ourselves with a brief summary of facts. Asked to withdraw

1. Kidd, "Documents C. Ref.", p. 39.

what he had written, the Monk of Wittenburg replied :—

" Some things I have written have been praised even by the Papal Bull ; some are against abuses and only a coward would retract in such cases. It may be some statements have been hastily written and if they are contrary to Holy Scripture I will readily retract." With words such as these and an assertion that " it cannot be right for a Christian to speak against his conscience," Luther concluded his speech with the memorable words " I stand here and can say no more : God help me. Amen."[1]

Luther's position was practically (*a*) Popes and Church Councils (ancient and modern) are not infallible and have frequently erred and, (*b*) that Holy Scripture is the true and final ground of appeal. The immediate end of the matter was that our Reformer was declared a " heretic and outlaw," and there is no reason to doubt that the Emperor Charles V. would have put the Papal edict into effect, thus ending Luther's career, only the political circumstances, at home and abroad, did not permit of such conduct.

Thus was Luther delivered from the hands of his enemies, and returning homeward he was " arrested " and conveyed to the Castle of Wartburg. Here he remained from May 1521 to March 1522 and with the assistance of a " Sanhedrin of learned men," published a German translation of the New Testament, the Old Testament being produced a few years later.

1. Morrison, " Reformation," p. 128–33 ; and Hagenbach I, p. 137.

That this work was a magnificent production is admitted by all, and Germans were never better than when they studied and practiced what was written therein.

* * * * *

From this point the story of the Lutheran Reformation opens out and we must reiterate that we aim at imparting a working knowledge of the subject and stating accurately, though briefly, the main facts and outlining the general position. From 1522 to 1524, the Diet of Nurnberg met three times, and Cardinal Campeggio demanded the execution of the Edict of Worms (1521) and the death of Luther as a heretic. "This" it was replied, "could not be effected at present" and the final outcome was that controversial preachers were ordered to be silent and preach the Gospel only, while the Diet, thanking the Pope for his kind (and as matters turned out, empty) promises of reform, reaffirmed the "*Centum Gravamina*" (the one hundred charges or complaints), thus showing the Pope that, whatever Germany thought of Luther, everybody was agreed as to the necessity of thorough-going reforms not only respecting Annates and Indulgences, but also with references to Church Services, etc. On receipt of this bad news Pope Adrian VI, died, for he had found reform quite impossible. Meanwhile, supporters and opponents of the Reformation took sides—leagues were formed but for some years peace was, with difficulty, maintained. We cannot fail to note that devout Roman Catho-

lics continually asked for reforms in return for their loyalty, but they merely received promises without performances.

We come now to August, 1526, when the Diet of Speyer was in session, an event which has been spoken of as " the turning point in the history of the Reformation.",[1] and though we would apply that phrase to a slightly later event (viz., the Diet of Speyer 1529) we are bound to note the conclusion of the 1526 Diet, presided over—in the absence of the Emperor Charles V.—by his brother Ferdinand of Austria. The settlement was on a principle known to scholars as *"Cuius regio, eius religio"* and may be stated thus " Each state shall govern itself and behave itself in matters of religion as it shall answer to God and His Imperial Majesty "—a kind of Home Rule for each State in religious affairs. The point to be observed is, that this ruling gave Luther and his friends an opportunity to organise the religious life of Saxony which he did, powerfully aided by the new Elector of Saxony John the Constant (1525–32) and his faithful, gentle and brilliantly-clever friend, Philip Melancthon, Greek Professor at Wittenberg, with other kindred and zealous spirits. Then came the second Diet of Speyer in 1529, with its " Recess " (a kind of Act of Parliament) which stipulated for " No further reforms and no one to be prevented from saying Mass. Both sides, Roman Catholic and Lutheran, to keep the revenues they now possessed : no toleration for Anabaptists and none for those who denied the

1. Kidd, " Continental Reformation," p. 40.

Real Presence."[1] This recess was meant to strengthen the already-shaken Papal power and to disallow those Reformers who wished to have a more thorough-going reform than Luther was attempting. The three years that had elapsed since freedom to organise had been granted, had been years of tremendous activity in Saxony and other States (*e.g.* Hesse, Brunswick and Anhalt), and Mosheim is perfectly correct in saying "All those in Germany who had before rejected the Romish authority, now carefully employed the liberty afforded them to strengthen their cause and to regulate properly their religious affairs. During this period, Luther and his associates, especially those who resided with him at Wittenberg, by their writings, their preaching, their admonitions and their refutations, added courage to the irresolute and imparted light and animation to all."[2]

Thus a ruling was now given differing vitally from that of 1526, which certainly tolerated Lutheran opinions and practices,[3] and the three years had witnessed the growth of a more vigourous reform. The 1529 "Recess" was meant to abolish this measure of religious freedom and equality. The Princes representing the Reformers from various States, drew up a protest demanding, in courteous, Christian language the rights of minorities and the rights of conscience. This protest, made on the 19th of April 1529, gave rise to the name "Protestant," the Princes who presented the statement being known as the

1. "Documents C. Ref.", p. 242.
2. "Ecclesiastical History"—16th Century, p. 580.
3. Robertson's "Charles V." Vol. II., p. 252.

"*Protestantes.*" We quote their concluding words :—

"For these reasons, most dear Lords and friends, we earnestly entreat you to weigh carefully our grievances and our motives. If you do not yield to our request, we PROTEST, by these presents before God our only Creator, Preserver, Redeemer and Saviour and Who will one day be our Judge, as well as before all men and all creatures, that we, for us and for our people, neither consent nor adhere in any manner whatsoever to the proposed decree, in anything that is contrary to God, to His Holy Word, to our right conscience, to the salvation of our souls and to the last decree of Speyer."[1]

This protest Ferdinand refused to receive and the Reformers made their position clear and explicit beyond argument by revising and republishing their statement in a document known as the "*Instrumentum Appellationis*" which document as the late Dr. Charles H. H. Wright has reminded us,[2] shews what the Reformers' definition of the term "Protestant" was :—"ALL WHO RECEIVE, OR SHALL HEREAFTER RECEIVE, THE WORD OF GOD." Thus Atheists, Libertines and other unsatisfactory persons, have no right whatever to the grand old name "Protestant."[3]

1. D'Aubigne's "History of the Reformation" p. 426.

2. "Protestant Dictionary" p. 552; and Ranke's "History," Book V. p. 559.

3. The name "Protestant" was all along accepted in England after the Reformation as the name of the Established religion—even by Archbishop Laud and the Caroline divines.

High hopes were now entertained by the Protestants owing to a great forthcoming event, viz., the return of the Emperor Charles who had been absent nearly ten years, fighting against France most of the time. And now he had announced his intention of presiding at a Diet at Augsburg in 1530 and both religious parties were ordered to state their case, for civil war was threatened.

In the meanwhile, with the object of presenting an united front as against the attack of Rome upon the religious liberties of Protestants generally, Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, convoked a gathering of German and Helvetic (Swiss) Reformers for a colloquy at his Castle at Marburg. Some fifteen theological articles were discussed and not until the last of that number was reached did dissension appear. The difference of opinion arose over the subject of the Presence of our Lord in the Holy Communion. Ulrich Zwingli, the heroic Swiss Reformer, had for almost three years disputed, in written articles, with Luther the Saxon, and neither had been willing to yield his opinion. The Reformers were men of sturdy intellect and quite obviously seekers after Divine Truth. And now Luther and his faithful colleague, Melancthon, opposed in debate Zwingli and his bosom friend Œcolampadius. All agreed that CHRIST was really present to his believing people, but Luther quoted the scriptural *Hoc est corpus meum* ("This is My body") and produced, as aforetimes, his doctrine of "Consubstantiation"; to the effect that the Body of CHRIST is "in, with and under the bread in the Lord's Supper." As Professor Lindsay truly says "Luther wove a most complicated

doctrine of CHRIST's presence in the bread and wine: he certainly got rid of "Transubstantiation,"[1] and of Priestly miracle, but he put obscure and improbable scholastic ideas in their place."[2]

Thus the Reformers disagreed, and we must add that Luther was less than at his best when he refused to shake hands with the warm-hearted and zealous Zwingli, who left the Conference in tears. Later discussions between the Reformers were, however, on more brotherly lines.

The time of the great Diet of Augsburg drew near and Protestant and Roman Catholic views were now to be publicly and definitely stated. Philip Melancthon drew up the famous "Augsburg Confession" assisted of course by Luther. The two great parties nearly arrived at a compromise but the Roman debater, Cardinal Campeggio and the controversialist Dr. Eck put an end to such a settlement by pointing out that "the Papacy and also the Priesthood of the Laity were not mentioned in the Confession." They both hoped to gain a victory over the divided Protestant forces, for the Swiss Reformers had presented their statement of belief (*Fidei Ratio*). And so the Protestants were declared to be confuted and were ordered to conform by April, 1531. True to Protestant tradition, the Reformers line up again and UNITEDLY presented the Augburg Confession as their statement of religious belief.

1. "*The change of substance*," so that the bread and wine in the Holy Communion become the literal Body and Blood of our LORD.

2. "The Reformation Handbook," p. 31.

Then followed a wearisome, wrangling business of Diets, Councils and Conferences (of Roman and Protestant Divines), with threats of war, and then actual war in which the Protestants were temporarily defeated (1546–47), and at last the Emperor Charles V. had to abdicate for using too much force and breaking his word. The final settlement—a maimed peace as some one has called it—was reached in 1555, while the Papacy was busy choosing another Pope, Julius III having just died. The terms briefly were (*a*) Every Sovereign is to be allowed to choose which of the two creeds he will adopt and enforce in his own dominions; (*b*) Ecclesiastical property secularised up to 1552 to be retained by those who held it; (*c*) No further changes to take place: an ecclesiastical prince changing from Roman Catholic to Protestant was to lose both Office and Revenues. The Protestants protested, without success, against this last clause being inserted in the agreement. Thus we see that the principles of the Diet of Speyer held in 1526, were here finally adopted.[1] The Roman and Lutheran Churches were both equally recognised but no allowance was made for the other Protestant churches with whom, as we shall see in the next chapter, the future of Protestantism chiefly lay. A number of German States stood outside of this "Religious Peace of Augsburg" objecting to the Lutheran doctrine of the Holy Communion and the Lutheran system of church

1. The full text of the "Religious Peace of Augsburg" (Sept. 25, 1555) is to be seen in "Documents C. Ref." p.p. 362–64.

Government, and asserting that they followed more closely on the lines of Holy Scripture and wished to have no interference with the government of their churches by the Civil power.

In the years that followed it is observed that the nations which embraced Lutheranism were Germany, Austria, Poland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark, whereas the influence of Lutheran doctrines was felt with varying degrees in every nation throughout Europe.

* * * * *

We must now retrace our steps in order to observe the advance of the theological and devotional aspects of the Reformation, which was a many-sided movement, the political and civil aspects being by no means the most important. It was in the stirring year 1518 that young Philip Melancthon, then only 21 years of age, came to Wittenburg to take up the important position of Greek Professor. He was closely related to leading humanistic scholars who, in some ways, were a valuable support to the Reformation.[1]

The personality of Luther attracted the talented young scholar: the leonine courage, religious zeal, obvious and occasionally blunt sincerity as well as the outstanding ability of Luther as preacher, lecturer and debater evidently being points of interest for the younger professor. Luther, though 14 years older than Melancthon, could not have secured a better or

1. See David Deane's "Life of Melancthon" for a simple, readable story.

more suitable companion and the great assistance the latter so tirelessly gave to the cause dear to both their hearts, was frequently acknowledged by the genial and good-natured leader of the Saxon reformation. In 1519 Melancthon took his B.D. degree and gave lectures on the Epistle to the Romans. These he published under the title "Theological Commonplaces"[1] during 1521, while Luther was imprisoned in the Wartburg. This work which attracted the greatest attention, going through many editions, was practically the beginning of Wittenberg Theology.

Melancthon's contribution to the Reformation has been summed up as follows:— "Without Luther, the Reformation would never have taken hold of the common people: without Melancthon, it would never have succeeded among the scholars of Germany."[2]

Luther did the rougher work and faced the worst of the opposition and slander to which the Reformers were nearly all subjected. There is a sense in which it may be asserted that Luther's most constructive work was done between the years 1521–30. Without disparaging excellent and most necessary work performed both before and after that period, let us observe Luther's chief tasks during this time of reconstruction.

Contenting ourselves with a rapid survey we note (*a*) his publication of the whole Bible in German. This was a grand work which, if it merely stood alone would entitle the man who

1. "Loci Communes rerum theologicarum."
2. See Hagenbach "Reformation" Vol. I, p. 116.

produced it to a worthy place among the world's famous men, introducing as it certainly did a new era in the history of the German language. "There are many who think that this translation into the vernacular and his devotional hymns were the worthiest parts of Luther's numerous works."[1]

(*b*) The publication of his "House Postills"; being addresses on the Gospels for the Sundays of the Christian year. Dean Wace's comment is worthy of reproduction, "They were delivered within Luther's domestic circle and recorded by two of his pupils, but though imperfectly reported they are treasures of evangelistic exposition, exhibiting in a rare degree, the exquisitely childlike character of the Reformer's faith and marked by all the simplicity and poetry of feeling by which his mind was distinguished. It is by such works as these and not simply by his controversial treatises or commentaries, that Luther must be judged if we wish to understand his inner character or to comprehend the vast personal influence he exerted."[2]

(*c*) The first German hymn book was published in 1524, the Reformer publishing twenty-four out of his thirty-six hymns at this time. Dr. Kidd remarks "the best of these hymns have reached England through John Wesley. Luther's powers as poet and composer rose to their height in 1527 with *Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott.*"[3]

1. Dr. J. Morrison's "Reformation" p. 252.
2. P.p. 435–36 "Luther's Primary Works."
3. "Con. Ref." p. 43, and Julian's "Dict. of Hymnology," Article on "Luther."

Dr. P. Schaff gives the following as a translation of the first verse of Luther's Battle-hymn " of the Reformation, thus :—

" With our own strength we nothing can
Full soon we were down-ridden,
But for us fights the proper man
Whom God Himself has bidden,
Ask ye, Who is the same ?
CHRIST JESUS is His Name
The Lord God Sabaoth ;
He, and no other God,
Shall conquer in the battle."

This hymn was, of course, based on *Psalm* xlvi.

(*d*) In 1526 he published his " German Mass and Order of Divine Service " and made radical changes in the recognised order of things. The Mass was now to be a Sacrament and not a propitiatory sacrifice. This was a definite break with Roman teaching, but a closer approximation to the New Testament doctrine which was what all the Reformers aimed at. This " German Mass " of 1526 is seen to be a simpler form of Holy Communion, along with the introduction of hymn-singing and considerably more preaching than had hitherto obtained. He strove to make all the church services more scriptural, spiritual and practically helpful, and his reformation was less radical than Calvin's, because of his acceptance of the principle that anything NOT INCONSISTENT WITH HOLY SCRIPTURE might be retained.

(*e*) The re-organisation of schools throughout Saxony was another great conservative action and there he insisted on the absolute need of

a knowledge of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. The prevailing ignorance was a challenge to believing Christians and Luther met it by the publication of two excellent Catechisms to which we shall shortly refer in detail.

(*f*) The Articles of Religion or Confessions of Faith were also published at this time *i.e.*, (1530). "The doctrinal matter of the Augsburg Confession, says Dr. Schaff, "was due to Luther, while Melancthon's scholarly and methodical mind elaborated it into its final shape and form and breathed into it a moderate conservative tone.[1] The Confession was in two parts: the former being evangelical and constructive in character, and the latter a powerful criticism and exposure of certain abuses tolerated and practised by the Church of Rome.

Brief as this outline of constructive work admittedly is, it will suffice to show that Luther, true Protestant that he was, was no mere blatant controversialist dealing only in noisy negatives. Add to the above list his Evangelical discourses and Commentaries particularly on the Psalms, Romans, Galatians and the Epistle to Hebrews, also his booklet " Concerning Christian Liberty," works chiefly outside the 1521–30 period which we have just named, and we get a fair idea of his definitely constructive work.

Then as to Luther the controversialist, he had few equals and most of his controversies were unavoidable, introducing thereby various doc-

1. " Creeds of Christendom," Vol. I, p. 229, and Hagenbach " Reformation," Vol. II, 117–121.

trines which the Christian world had for generations forgotten or allowed to become practically obsolete. His controversies included debates on such subjects as the " Primacy of the Pope," " Justification by Faith in CHRIST," the " Necessity of Holy Scripture as the final authority in matters of faith and Practice,"—as against Antinomians and Roman Catholics. He also debated the subjects of " Predestination " with the humanist Erasmus and the " Real Presence " with Ulrich Zwingli.

It has sometimes been objected against Luther that he could on occasions be rude and inconsiderate to opponents and indeed to his fellow-Reformers (*e.g.* Zwingli, Erasmus and others): and that at times his phraseology was either too loose or too rough or too highly coloured, etc. Criticisms of this general character are not altogether without weight, for while some have depicted the great Reformer as nearly destitute of virtue, others have shown him as something approaching the superhuman and divine. A list of enemies and friends of Luther during the past four centuries would provide interesting reading. Some great scholars have attacked the personality and teaching of Luther, but a vast majority have recognised him as the giant of courage, learning and administrative ability which he undoubtedly was. We must not think he was infallible nor accept a truth merely because he taught it: our appeal, like his, must be to the Word of God. It is an important point to be remembered by all who undertake to adversely criticise Luther's writings, how fond he is of the paradoxical and the antithetical.

Thus no single sentence should be taken without careful reference to its context.[1] We recognise (and might quote) here and there defects and occasionally incautious statements, but they can only be regarded as mere details when compared with his innumerable counterbalancing virtues. We love Luther despite his minor faults and would follow him in so far as he was faithful to CHRIST and His Word—which is indeed saying much.

A wise word from the Dean of Canterbury, appears to meet fairly the criticism that Luther does not always use twentieth century drawing-room phraseology. It reads as follows:—

"It was one thing for Englishmen, several decades after 1520, to apply these principles with the wisdom and moderation of which we are proud: it was another thing to be the Horatius of that vital struggle."

In a word Luther was exactly the type of man the times and the situation required. The majority of men, if equal in ability and learning, would have collapsed under the strain of Papal threats and excommunications.

* * * * *

In the year 1525, Dr. Luther, to the scandalisation of a section of the public, was actually

1. Those who wish to read further ought to see K. von Hase "Handbook to the Controversey with Rome" (R.T.S.) Vol. II., where (pp. 18 and 37) notes may be read on *Fide sola* (Faith alone) and pp. 27–8 his letter to Melancthon on "Sin mightily." Also Bishop Lightfoot's note in "Galatians," p. 350. See Lindsay Vol. I. p. 462 and Hagenbach Vol. I, p. 159 for "Luther on the Epistle of S. James."

2. "Primary Principles" p. 446.

married! Roman Catholic historians have made much of this extraordinary act since Luther was "an ex-friar, marrying" as Dr. Kidd graciously puts it "an escaped nun,"[1] the lady's name being Catharine von Bora; the date of the wedding June 13th.[2] Leaving aside the ungracious remarks of some who ought to have known that silence would have been wiser, we may observe that the marriage of the Clergy was recognised by no less an authority than St. Peter, who was himself a married man. When it was suggested at the Council of Nicæa in 325 A. D. that Clerical celibacy should be the rule of the Church, this was strongly opposed by the saintly and celibate Egyptian bishop Paphnutius. "Under his guidance, the Council rejected the proposal and the example thus set by the most revered of ecclesiastical assemblies was followed in other quarters."[3] Not until 1074, was Clerical celibacy effectually imposed, the Pope that did this unchristian act being Gregory VII. Thus Luther merely claimed and used a right which was unquestionably his, and which the leading churches throughout the world have since readily recognised. It would be easy to quote sordid details, supported by irrefutable facts, to prove that it was quite time that this evil of enforced celibacy was abolished, and it would be equally easy to show the advan-

1. "Cont. Ref." p. 38.

2. The "Catholic Dictionary" is, as we should expect, unfriendly disposed towards "Catharine," and the writer forgets the testimony of history as to Convents.

3. Canon J. C. Robertson "History of the Christian Church," Vol. I. pp. 443–44.

tages of having a married clergy as in the case of the various Reformed Churches. Need we add that "forbidding to marry" is one of the marks of the apostacy foretold by St. Paul in I Tim. iv. 3 (see also I Cor. vii. 9)? Scurrilous persons have also foolishly asserted that the main idea of Luther's revolt against Rome was, that he wished to break his monastic vow of lifelong celibacy. We will only remark that the date of the publication of the ninety-five Theses was October 1517, and the date of his marriage June 1525; at which time he was forty-two years of age.

The testimony of Luther and Erasmus as to the need of Monastic reform (pp. 12 and 54) should be remembered. K. von Hase[1] adds that of John Wycliffe in "Trialog iv. p. 26" (1380 A. D.) and Nicholas of Clemanges, Rector of Paris University (1393). We say advisedly, that reform was long overdue.

* * * * *

We may here find space for a brief note on the Council of Trent, since that gathering, or rather series of gatherings, was demanded by the Emperor Charles V. when he thought he had conquered Protestantism. Both Roman Catholics and Lutherans had asked repeatedly for a General Church Council, which it was hoped would settle disputes and bring lasting peace. But two or three main factors in the problem forbade such a settlement. They were as follows:—(*a*) The Pope did not desire a Council; the 15th Century Councils of Pisa, Constance,

1. "Handbook" Vol. II, p. 51.

and Basle had not furthered Papal power; (*b*) Councils had a habit of asking for reforms which Rome would not and could not grant; and (*c*) the Emperor and Pope were jealous of each other and both desirous of gaining fresh wealth and authority. The Pope eventually agreed to the Emperor's demands and the latter consented to the Papal claim to call such a Council. There were really three Councils of Trent, viz., 1545–47, 1551–53, 1562–64. Each council sat for two years and there were twenty-five sessions. The scheming on the part of the papacy is a wearisome story and we are fortunate to be able to cut it short by stating briefly the result of the Council's deliberations. In 1564 Pope Pius IV., modestly signing himself "the Bishop of the Catholic Church," promulgated the Creed with its twelve novel articles of faith[1] which with some recent additions are the belief of present day Roman Catholics.

Tradition and Scripture (note the order) are of co-ordinate authority, and "practically the whole round of mediæval orthodoxy was confirmed without any serious modification."[2] Consequently the Seven Sacraments, Transubstantiation, belief in Purgatory and Indulgences are among the beliefs of the modern Church of Rome. Her motto is still, as it has been for a few centuries past, "*semper eadem*"—always the same. Thus, in the sixteenth Century, Rome definitely refused the opportunity of a scriptural reformation within her borders.

* * * * *

1. See "English Church Teaching" p. 52.
2. Dr. Kidd "Cont. Ref." p. 65, and Jewel's "Apology."

For the lighter and gentler side of Luther's character nothing better could be quoted than his charming letter to his infant son John.[1] As to his moral character the funeral ovation by his friend Melancthon proves what an upright and commendable life the Reformer had lived. This may be read elsewhere.[2] "Thus died Martin Luther in the 63rd year of his age, exhausted not so much by the number of his days as by the toils of his existence, which had been one continued, living sacrifice on the altar of truth . . the date was 18th February, 1546."

BRIEF NOTES AND OUTLINES OF LUTHER'S CHIEF WORKS.

(A) "The Ninety-five Theses," 31 October, 1517: Addressed to the most Reverend Father in CHRIST and most illustrious LORD, Albert, Archbishop and Primate of the Churches of Magdeburg and Mentz. The accompanying letter shows that Luther was shocked at the immorality involved in the sale of Indulgences for the building of St. Peter's Church at Rome. "These false pardons are leading the people astray. There is consequently no Gospel preaching and the souls of men are left to the deceits of faithless teachers."

1. Luther's "Table Talk" or Thos. Shorter's "English Chrestomathy" p. 164.
2. Morrison "Reformation" pp. 248–9, etc.
3. Ibid, p. 243.

Luther asks (in posting up his Theses on the Church and University Notice Board) "those who cannot be present and discuss the subject with us orally, to do so by letter in their absence."

Some of the leading Theses were as follows :—[1]

(1) Our LORD and MASTER JESUS CHRIST in saying "Repent ye," etc., intended that the whole life of believers should be penitence.

(7) GOD never remits any man's guilt, without at the same time subjecting him humbled in all things, to the authority of his representative the priest.[2]

(21) Those preachers of Indulgences are in error, who say that, by the indulgences of the Pope, a man is loosed or saved from all punishment.

(27) They preach man, who say that the soul flies out of purgatory, as soon as the money thrown into the chest rattles.

(28) It is certain, that, when the money rattles in the chest, avarice and gain may be increased, but the suffrage of the Church depends on the will of GOD alone.

(43) Christians should be taught that he who gives to a poor man, or lends to a needy man, does better than if he bought pardons.

1. Wace and Buchheim's translation in "Luther's Primary Works," and Kidd's Documents p. 21–26. Latin version.

2. Luther, at this time, regarded "Penance" as a Sacrament of the Gospel. See K. von Hase on this subject Vol. II. pp. 179-86.

(50) Christians should be taught that, if the Pope were acquainted with the exactions of the preachers of pardons, he would prefer that the Basilica of St. Peter should be burnt to ashes than that it should be built up with the skin, flesh and bones of his sheep.

(56) The treasures of the Church, whence the Pope grants indulgences, are neither sufficiently named nor known among the people of CHRIST.

(57) It is clear that they are at least not temporal treasures, for these are not so readily lavished, but only accumulated, by many of the preachers.

(58) Nor are they the merits of CHRIST and of the saints, for these, independently of the Pope, are always working grace to the inner man and the cross, death, and hell to the outer man.

(62) The true treasure of the Church is the Holy Gospel of the glory and grace of GOD.

(75) To think that Papal pardons have such power that they can absolve a man even if—by an impossibility—he had violated the Mother of GOD, is madness.

(76) We affirm on the contrary that Papal pardons cannot take away even the least of venial sins, as regards its guilt, etc., etc.

(B) "To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation respecting the Reformation of the Christian Estate."

Addressed to the Emperor Charles V. and to the people as a whole, August, 1520.

"The time for silence" says Luther, "is gone and the time to speak has come." He writes, "in case it may please GOD to help His church by means of the laity, inasmuch as the clergy, whom this task rather befitted, have become quite careless. . . . . GOD has now given us a young and noble sovereign and by this, has roused great hopes in many hearts. . . . . The Romanists have, with great adroitness, drawn three walls round themselves, with which they have hitherto protected themselves, so that no one could reform them, whereby all Christendom has fallen terribly . . . . Now may GOD help us and give us one of those trumpets that overthrew the walls of Jericho so that we may blow down these walls of straw and paper."

The three walls are then seen to be the assertions of Rome (*a*) That the temporal power has no jurisdiction over the spiritual. (*b*) That no one may interpret the Scriptures but the Pope, and (*c*) That no one may call a Council but the Pope. Luther's line of attack was very powerful and, in reply to papal claims, he boldly asserted that all Christians are truly of the spiritual estate and that there is no difference among them save of office alone." Thus the Laity are qualified to interpret Holy Scripture and sit in Councils. "Moreover, if the Pope acts contrary to the Scriptures, we are bound to stand by the Scriptures to punish and constrain him according to CHRIST'S commandment in S. Matthew xviii. 15–17." The Laity have privileges but they also have corresponding duties, and as loyal churchmen they are called

upon to assist in Church reform, led by their Princes and great men.

In Part II. of this extraordinary pamphlet, as Dr. Kidd remarks, "Luther chastises the pomp and greed of popes and cardinals and concludes Part III. with a long and trenchant statement of abuses such as annates, commendams, pall-money, and the innumerable exactions of that crowd of crawling vermin at Rome, with which the temporal authorities or . . . . a general Council should make short work." He would have the German Nation to become a free people of Christians under the Primate of Germany and an Emperor free of the Pope."[1] In the twenty-seven statements concerning the need of Reformation, there is much excellent plain speaking, but we conclude with one up-to-date piece of sound common sense. "But in order that many sins may be prevented that are becoming too common, I would honestly advise that no boy or girl be allowed to take the vow of chastity or to enter a religious life before the age of thirty years. For this requires a special grace, as St. Paul says, "Therefore, unless GOD specially urge any one to a religious life he will do well to leave all vows and devotions alone."[2]

This booklet "To the Christian Nobility," was to be read by all and so it was written in a language "understanded of the people," viz., German. It made the greatest impression and in a few days four thousand copies were

1. "Continental Reformation," p. 22.
2. Wace and Buchheim, pp. 156–244.

in circulation, and the presses could not print fast enough for the demand. Professor Lindsay says, "It was a call to all Germany to unite against Rome. It was nobly comprehensive: it grasped the whole situation and summed up with vigour and clearness all the German grievances which had hitherto been stated separately and weakly[1]." Dr. Wace, in his essay on "Luther's Life and Teaching" remarks "In the Appeal to the German Nobility he first asserted those rights of the laity and of the temporal power without the admission of which no reformation would have been practicable and he then denounced with burning moral indignation the numerous and intolerable abuses which were upheld by Roman authority."[2]

(C) "The Babylonish Captivity of the Church" Published in October, 1520, was written in Latin, as it was addressed to Theologians. Luther is now certain that Rome cannot reform and he wishes he had written more plainly on Indulgences three years previously. His position in 1520 is stronger, and he boldly asserts that "Indulgences are wicked devices of the flatterers of Rome," and that "The papacy is the mighty hunting ground of the Bishop of Rome."[3] He forthwith examines the Seven Sacraments of the Church of Rome, testing them by the standard of Holy Scripture. Consequently the seven are reduced to two, viz., Baptism and the LORD'S Supper, with Penance as a kind of Sacrament, for he fears to be misunderstood by the common

1. "Reformation" Vol. I., p.p 242–246.
2. "Primary Works" p. 426.
3. Ibid, pp. 294–95.

people. He rightly insists that repentance is indispensable in our approach to God. "A contrite heart is a great matter indeed and can only proceed from an earnest faith in the Divine promises and threats,"[1] and again "The secret confession, however, which is now practised, though it cannot be proved from Scripture, is in my opinion highly satisfactory and useful or even necessary,"[2] whereas a little later we read, "CHRIST has manifestly bestowed the power of absolution on every believer in Him, with whatever violence the pontiffs may rage against this truth."[3] We may remind our readers that Rome's seven Sacraments include the LORD'S Supper or Holy Communion, Baptism, Penance, Confirmation, Matrimony, Holy Orders and Extreme Unction. All seven were critically examined on Reformation principles with the Holy Scriptures as the final Court of appeal and much that was worthless and superstitious swept away. King Henry VIII. of England (assisted by Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher of Rochester) attacked this book and Henry received for his efforts the title *Fidei Defensor*; the Pope of the period, attributing the regal reply to Luther as a work produced with the special assistance of the Holy Spirit.[4]

(D) "Concerning Christian liberty."

This work, the last of the three great Reformation Treatises in 1520, was published in October. It was much shorter than the two

1. Ihid, p. 368.
2. Ibid, p. 370.
3. Ibid, p. 372.
4. Canon Daniel "English History," p. 114.

previously noted and differed entirely from them in its mission and scope. It was addressed to Pope Leo X. and was of course written in Latin. With the booklet went a letter which contained the following points. Luther has no desire to be other than respectful to the Pope and is attacking the system rather than the Bishop at the head of the papacy. "I have never thought any evil concerning your person . . . . Your See, however, which is called the Court of Rome, and which neither you nor any man can deny to be more corrupt than any Babylon or Sodom and quite, as I believe, of a lost, desperate and hopeless impiety, this I have verily abominated" . . . . Rome hates councils; she dreads to be reformed . . . . there is nothing under the vast heavens more corrupt . . . . than the Court of Rome." "I am so far from having felt any rage against your person, that I hoped to gain favour with you and to aid in your welfare by striking actively and vigorously at your prison."[1] And again "The Roman debaters, Dr. Eck and Cardinal Cajetan did not desire peace: they hoped to catch me in a little word concerning the primacy of the Church of Rome . . . . The Fathers of the (Augustinian) Order assembled in chapter said that the affair was not in a position of extreme hopelessness if Leo X. would put his hand to it." Luther also asserts "They are in error who raise you above Councils and the universal Church; they are in error who attribute to you alone the right of interpreting Scripture . . . . if, in this serious matter, you do not see that I am

1. Wace and Buchheim, p. 247–249.

your friend and most thoroughly your subject, there is One to see and judge." Then follows the pamphlet "Concerning Christian liberty" in which the author lays down these two propositions concerning Christian liberty and servitude. (*a*) A Christian man is the most free lord of all and subject to none, and (*b*) A Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all and subject to every one.

"These statements although they appear to be contradictory" says Luther, "yet when they are found to agree together will make excellently for my purpose. They are both statements of Paul himself I Cor. ix. 19, "Though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all," and Rom. xiii. 8, "Owe no man anything but to love one another."[1] All those who assert that Luther merely taught a doctrine of "Justification by faith alone without works following" (*sola fide*), cannot do better than read this pamphlet of Luther's. He follows precisely on St. Paul's line in the "Epistle to the Romans" dealing first with Justification by faith in Christ alone, and proceeding immediately to consider Sanctification, which always necessarily follows Justification and is regarded, in its outward aspects, as the proof of the reality of the Salvation which is by faith in Christ alone, whereby the believer is reckoned as righteous in the Heavenly Father's presence.[2]

(E) "The Greater Catechism" for the use of Pastors and Teachers was published in the Spring of

1. "Primary Works," p. 256.
2. Sanday and Headlam "Commentary on Romans"; see "Justification," pp. 28-36.

1529, and eventually, abbreviated and simplified, republished for the use of children and unlearned people, as a "Shorter Catechism." Reversing the order, we may comment briefly on the Introduction to this shorter catechism. Luther produced it as a result of his visitation of Schools in Saxony where he found the grossest ignorance even of the simplest precepts of Christianity. He blames the bishops for paying so much attention to refusing the Cup to the Laity and yet never asking if the children and young people know the Ten Commandments. He instructs Teachers as to methods of presenting religious knowledge, emphasizing the need of teaching with literal accuracy the words of Holy Scripture, the meaning of the words thus learned by heart, and then the deeper, fuller explanation and its application to daily Christian living. He also desires Teachers to reiterate that "though the tyranny of the Pope is past, loyalty to the Church of CHRIST and to its Ordinances and Sacraments is as necessary as ever: Freedom must not be abused even by the dullest." Instead of blind trust in the papacy we are called to "active service, more troublesome and full of labour . . . . with little reward or thanks in this world. But CHRIST Himself will be our reward if we work faithfully." Truly a worthy message for the twentieth, as well as the sixteenth, century!

The Shorter Catechism contains simple questions and answers with reference to the Ten Commandments, The Creed, the LORD'S Prayer, Holy Baptism, a short form of Confession, and the Sacrament of the Altar, also Prayers for Morning and Evening with the instruction ("In the

morning when thou risest from thy bed, sign thyself with the Holy Cross and say, 'In the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, Amen,' etc."), the Blessing and Thanksgiving at meals and a Table of Home duties, with the following quaint exhortation as the conclusion of the Catechism :—

> "Let each one learn his lesson well,
> Then in the house content will dwell."[1]

It is generally understood that the Morning and Evening Prayers in this Catechism were borrowed from a similiar compilation of the Bohemian Brethren, and the points of interest may be noted (*a*) Luther's desire to give sound moral and Biblical teaching. (*b*) Some will object to his phraseology and the doctrine and practices inculcated but (*c*) all will agree that he was seriously endeavouring to improve religious education on the most conservative lines—a point to be remembered when we hear the assertion made that he only lived to destroy the beautiful past.

The Greater Catechism was on similiar lines and dwelt with the The Creed, LORD'S Prayer, Ten Commandments and *the Two Sacraments*, (Holy Baptism and Holy Communion) for by this time (1529), although he taught a more scriptural form of Confession, he had ceased to regard "Penance" as a Sacrament.[2] The teaching regarding the Presence of CHRIST is, as we would expect to find it in a Lutheran Catechism, Consubstantiation. "It is the true

1. Kidd's "Documents," pp. 205–22.
2. "Primary Works," p. 129.

body and blood of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, in and under the bread and wine, through CHRIST'S word, appointed for us Christians to eat and drink."[1]

Other features of the Catechism are words of warning to the over-confident who exist in every community, and words of encouragement to those who feel they are not good enough to approach the LORD'S Table. With an example of this latter kind we must conclude :—

" Accordingly thou hast, on GOD'S part, both CHRIST'S command and promise : and for thine own sake thou shouldest be induced to partake of it by the need which weighs upon thee, and for the sake of which this command and promise were given. For CHRIST Himself says, " They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." That is, those who are troubled and burdened with sin, fear of death, temptation of the flesh and the devil. If thou art burdened and dost feel thy weakness, accept it cheerfully and be refreshed, comforted, strengthened. For if thou thinkest to delay till thou art rid of such feelings, so that thou mayest come pure and worthy to the Sacrament, then thou must ever remain away : for He has pronounced this judgment and said, " If thou art pure and upright then thou dost not need me, nor do I need thee. Therefore only those are unworthy who do not feel their sins and will not admit that they are sinners."[2] As an evangelical appeal to professing Church people, could anything be more faithful or tender ?

1. Ibid, p. 153–54.
2. Primary Works, p. 153–54.

SOME OUTSTANDING POINTS IN LUTHER'S TEACHING.

I.—(*a*) We are justified by faith in JESUS CHRIST alone, apart from any merit on our own. Some of Luther's statements on the Law (*e. g.*, in his "Commentary on Galatians") are stronger than most writers would indulge in to-day. Notwithstanding, fairly interpreted, he merely means to shut out works from all direct share in the justification of the sinner. "CHRIST hath redeemed us once for all" as St. Paul teaches in Romans and Galatians. Space forbids a quotation, but Luther's "Preface to Romans" and note on *Gal.* ii. 16, are remarkably fine.

(*b*) No one spoke more plainly on the need of a clean and godly life. He attacked the Antinomians in the boldest manner and taught the Pauline doctrine as clearly as possible, *e. g.*, "It is not from works that we are set free by the faith of CHRIST, but from the belief in works, that is, from foolishly presuming to seek justification through works."

To Luther, almost more than any other Reformer, we are as Christian people, for ever indebted for the recovery of this infinitely important Christian doctrine, that Salvation is a free gift of God to all repentant sinners. We cannot bargain with the Almighty: our part is to accept His mercy in and through CHRIST JESUS. And yet while "it is Faith alone that justifies, the faith which justifies is never alone."

1. "Concerning Christian Liberty," Wace p. 288. See also striking passages on pp. 277, 280 and 287.

II.—The Priesthood of the Laity. "Between laymen and priests or as they call it between spiritual and temporal persons, the only real difference is one of office and function and not of estate" as in Romans xii. and I Cor. xii. Without this doctrine and that which asserted the rights of the temporal power, the reformation would have been almost impossible. The Clergy are important members of the Church, and without organization and order no work for God can be prosecuted, but the Clergy are not the Church. Luther desired to reintroduce the Laity to their rightful position as co-workers in the cause of Christ.[1]

III.—The Supremacy of Holy Scripture as the ultimate standard of faith and the right of private judgement. We remember his memorable reply in this matter at the Diet of Augsburg, 1518, and again at Worms in 1521. We have also observed in the "Christian Nobility" that the second wall of the Papacy to be demolished, was the Papal claim to be the only interpreter of scripture. We observed the introduction of more scripture and its exposition in the German Church Services. This was only to be expected from the courageous man who had striven to give his Countrymen an open Bible.

IV.—Luther also magnified the Office of Teacher. His Catechisms, despite some minor points that might be criticised, are models that would hardly be out of place even in this day,

1. See P. Schaff "Apostolic Christianity," Vol. II, p. 481, *et seq.*, for an excellent article.

and his worst enemy has scarcely offered to attack him for the magnificent hymns he published, to the number of some three dozen.

V.—His doctrine of "Consubstantiation" was distinctly unfortunate. To this "unintelligible absurdity,"[1] he clung with the most obstinate adherence. Summed up and stated briefly, his idea seems to have been that of the real presence not of CHRIST, but of CHRIST'S body and blood in the LORD'S Supper, or the coexistence, in some way, of the real flesh and blood of CHRIST in, with, or under (*in, cum, aut sub*) the bread and wine in the Eucharist. This was a real remnant of Romanism but Luther appears to have striven to give a literal meaning to "This is My body," and yet to deny the Roman (not Catholic) doctrine of Transubstantiation. Hence for a more scriptural teaching on the LORD'S Supper we need to look to other Reformers to whom now we must turn.

* * * * * * *

1. Principal Cunningham "The Theology of the Reformation," p. 105.

III.

John Calvin

(1509–1564).

The International Reformer.

Few men have been more obviously prepared for a great life work that the subject of the study to which we now turn.

John Calvin (or Chauvin) was born at Noyon, a city of Picardy, on the 10th of July, 1509. His father, Gerard Calvin, was Apostolic Notary in the Ecclesiastical Court and Secretary to the Bishop, Charles de Hangest. It will not surprise us, therefore, to find that the youthful John had many educational advantages and there was no need in his case, as in Luther's, to sing in the streets as a begging student. Receiving his elementary education with the children of the local noble house of the de Mommors, he was brought up amid the refinements of the time and his gentlemanly deportment may be traced to inward character and outward advantages.

When only twelve years of age, there was secured for him a benefice in the Chapelle de Notre Dame de la Gesine in the cathedral of Noyon,[1] This office was given to young Calvin

1. Beza's "Icones," p. 138.

by the Bishop at Gerard Calvin's request, but despite the fact of his being a Prebendary at twelve and having received the tonsure as a juvenile chaplain, John Calvin (like the other Protestant dogmatist, Philip Melancthon) was never "ordained" At fourteen years of age, owing to plague at Noyon, the boy was permitted to depart and journeyed to Paris to continue his studies; his teacher being the celebrated Latinist, Mathurin Corderier—a fellow pupil being Ignatius Loyola, a Spaniard who eventually founded the "Society of Jesus" (the Jesuits). The youth also studied logic and philosophy with marked success under Poblatius, a learned Spaniard, whom the King (Francis I.) had brought to France in the interests of literature and science.[1]

On receipt of the report of good progress as a Parisian student Calvin, now eighteen years of age, was preferred, thanks to his father's influence, to the cure of Marteville, which two years later (1529) he exchanged for that of Pont l'Evêque. We next find him at the University of Orleans studying law under Pierre de l'Etoile (a future president of the parliament of Paris) and in 1533 he proceeded to his LL.D. degree, to which doctorate he apparently advanced, on account of his outstanding ability, without the payment of the usual fees. In search of further learning he departed to Bourges where he attended the lectures of the Milanese jurist, Andrea Alciati.[2] At Bourges he also came in touch with another light of the learned world brought thither

1. *ibid*, p. 139.
2. Kidd "Documents of Cont. Ref." pp. 521–22.

by Francis I, one Melchior Wolmar a Greek scholar, though of German nationality. This good man acquainted Calvin of how matters were progressing in Germany and of the interest the Reformation movement was arousing. Meanwhile, in June 1531, Gerard Calvin died and John returned to Paris not as a law student, but to study theology with a view to ordination. Owing to the equal influences of Wolmar and of his cousin Robert Olivetan, Calvin was induced to study the New Testament. The following year he published his first work a learned commentary on the two books of Seneca's *De Clementia.* In this work Calvin, scarcely twenty-three years of age, gives us, says Prof. Lindsay, "an example of precocious erudition . . . . He quotes, and that aptly, from fifty-five separate Latin authors and twenty-two separate Greek authors."[1] We may date his sudden conversion about the end of 1532, though the exact date is uncertain. In the case of Luther we have a full and charming account of the great and definite change in his life: with Calvin we have to be satisfied with an undeniable fact, supported by no detailed account. He forthwith relinquished his Church emoluments and renounced the legal profession for which his father had caused him to be so splendidly trained, and soon became the leader of a little company of French Protestants who met in Paris for prayerful study of Holy Scripture. It took but a short time for such a leader to come into controversy with the Church of the day as represented by the learned doctors of the Sorbonne, but the immediate

1. Hist. Ref., Vol. II, pp. 96–97.

cause of his departure from the city was the discovery of the fact that Calvin had been assisting the Rector of the University of Paris (Nicholas Cop) in the production of a public address which contained severe criticisms of the Church.

Returning to the city in the following year (1534), he might have remained there to do his life's work, but some zealous and short-sighted Protestants covered the neighbourhood with placards expressing sentiments of antipathy towards the settled order of ecclesiastical doctrines and practices in strongly-worded phrases. It was at Paris about this time that Calvin met a man with whom, unhappily, he was to meet again at Geneva—Michael Servetus, a Spanish physician and an adventurous theologian who seemed to be in search of the stake. We will only observe at this point that Servetus was a man who loved to speak blasphemy, challenging Roman or Protestant thinkers on such profound subjects as the Holy Trinity, etc. "He now challenged Calvin and was accepted, but at the appointed time for debate he was absent."[1]

Reverting to the subject of the "placards," by them the opposition of Francis I, was roused and a terrible persecution arose in character, though not in dimensions, somewhat like that inaugurated by the Roman Emperor Nero, many innocent and godly persons being tortured to death.

Meanwhile Calvin journeyed through Strassburg to Basle where he met some of the most

1. Bungener "Life of Calvin," p. 34.

learned and famous reformers, including Capito and Erasmus. Here he finished the first draft of his great book " The Institutes of the Christian Religion " with its apologetic preface addressed, in direct though polished style, to Francis I. It was a much smaller book than the present day edition of 1270 closely printed pages, for Calvin worked on it, enlarging and revising it over a period of twenty-four years. The first edition was about one third the size of the work in its final form, and its six chapters dealt with the Ten Commandments, the Apostles' creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, a criticism proving the falsity of the five sacraments which the Roman church taught (as she still does), and a short essay on Christian liberty.[1] This great Reformation treatise, written originally in Latin and French, was speedily translated into every European language. " It was at once recognised, by enemies no less than friends, as marking an epoch in theology ; and it has won for him from later scholars the title of " the Aristotle," or better " the Thomas Aquinas " of the Reformed."[2] We shall again make reference to the " Institutes " and so we pass on to the story of Calvin's further activities. Remaining at Basle some months, he eventually departed with the object of visiting Renée, Duchess of Ferrara, cousin of Francis I ; herself a great supporter of Reformation principles and known for her genuine piety. The Reformer travelled in those

1. Bungener " Life of Calvin," p. 44. See also Creed of Pope Pius (1564) in " English Church Teaching," p. 52.
2. Kidd " Con. Ref." p. 92.

dangerous days under the assumed name of Charles d'Espeville. Returning to Strassburg an incident happened which again changed the course of Calvin's life—his desire to live the student life was not to be fulfilled. Was this next step chance or Providence? If we believe the Reformation was 'of God,' we are bound to accept the view that it was His directive Providence that directed the steps of John Calvin from the quiet haven of the study at Basle to the stormy sea of godless, licentious Geneva. On its human side, the story is simply this, that owing to war between France and Germany, he had to make a detour through Savoy. In his *Commentary on the Psalms* he gives a lengthy preface which shows that he merely intended to remain at Geneva a single night and then continue his homeward journey. Here, however, he met William Farel, a disciple of Lefèvre,[1] capable, zealous and eloquent. This man, in company with another French evangelist and

1. James Lefevre was a grand character. Born at Etaples in Picardy (1455 c.) of poor parents and with few educational advantages, he was possessed of a rare intellect and a great desire to know the truth and was one of the first to preach the Reformation doctrines in France. In 1493 he obtained his D.D. degree and became Professor of Theology at the University of Paris. In 1523 he published a French translation of the N.T., and was engaged assisting Bishop Briconnet of Meaux. Owing to persecution, arising from a criticism of the dissolute lives of the clergy, the Meaux brotherhood was dispersed, but the seeds of the French Reformation had been sown and that, let us note, by Frenchmen: it was not a foreign importation. See also D'Aubigne "Reformation," Book XII., Chapter II., and Beza "Icones," p. 192–98 where Lefevre is shown to have been a specialist in philosophy, etc.

scholar, Peter Viret, had been some few years striving for the cause of the Gospel in Geneva, a city where infidelity and immorality seemed to flourish almost naturally. Farel saw at once that the young Christian student who had come to Geneva was precisely the man he needed to assist him in the difficult task: thus was Calvin invited to remain in the city. But no such intention had crossed his mind and he wished to continue his studies.[1] Farel thereupon proceeded to "utter an imprecation that God would curse my retirement and the tranquility of the studies which I sought, if I should withdraw and refuse assistance when the necessity was so urgent. By this imprecation I was so stricken with terror that I desisted from the journey which I had undertaken."[2] Before describing Calvin's work at Geneva, a brief note with reference to the government of the city may be helpful. Geneva, like two or three English cities, owed its obedience to a prince-bishop: at this time one Pierre de la Baume. He and the Duke of Savoy had quarrelled, and a republican constitution had been adopted in 1526, the bishop also being limited to his ecclesiastical rights. Farel, soon followed by Calvin, began work "at a moment when deliverance from political servitude had revived a distaste for moral restraints. Geneva was a rich and pleasure-loving city, with an excitable population, a habit of turbulence and a loose code of public and private morals. In earlier days it had been necessary to prohibit dancing, masquerades and ostentatious display.

1. Calvin's Commentary, p. 42.
2. *ibid*, p. 43.

The preachers took a stand against these things and soon complaints were made by many that their reproofs were intolerable."[1] To the same effect is the testimony of Felix Bungener, viz., "From 1503–11 four laws were passed against games of chance and from 1484–1516 four against dancing. Debauchery, drunkenness and blasphemy had also called forth ordinances . . . points to be remembered by those who criticise Calvin too severely."[2] Dr. Lindsay makes a similar comment and adds—"The city was full of scepticism, licentiousness, and superstition, Papal indulgences always sold well in Geneva."[3] His first work was the exposition of Scripture, in which he excelled; his homiletic output being quite prodigious. Probably Calvin and Bishop Jewel were the greatest workers of the Reformation period.

Calvin soon discovered that Geneva required a definite statement of Christian doctrine and the practice of Christian discipline, which needs he attempted to supply by the production, in April 1537, of a Catechism and a "Confession of Faith" which contained twenty-one articles, admirably summing up definite Christian doctrines and exposing the errors of Rome.

Conditions of space will not permit of an outline of either the Confession or the Catechism. The outlook was of course precisely the same as the "Institutes" An outline may be found in Bungeners "Life of Calvin."[4] and the full text

1. Kidd "Con. Ref." pp. 93–94.
2. "Life of Calvin," p. 110.
3. "Handbook," pp. 56 and 60.
4. pp. 105–115.

of the Confession in Latin in Kidd's "Documents of the Continental Reformation."[1] The influence of these works of Calvin was extensive and may be traced in the history of the Churches of France, the Netherlands and Scotland.

There have always been persons who would die for religion, though they stedfastly refuse to live for it ; men whose zeal for casting off the yoke of Rome was only equalled by their determination not to accept the yoke of CHRIST (St. Matt. xi. 28–30). Hence it was that Calvin's first sojourn in Geneva only lasted twenty months ; a period of hard labour and painful disputes. He had to defend himself against fanatical Anabaptists, as well as against Peter Caroli who was wicked and foolish enough to charge him with Arianism (*i.e.* denying the true Divinity of our Lord) ; a charge which Calvin soon proved baseless.

In our previous book " St. Clodock : British King and Martyr " we have described more fully the tenets of the Lollards and the Anabaptists. Here it will suffice to say regarding the latter : They were the more extreme wing of the Reformation movement. Many of them were excellent people who, understanding that faith should *always* precede baptism, refused to have their infants baptised. All the Reformers were against such a line of conduct. But the Anabaptists unfortunately included among their numbers some who would have overthrown the State Government by force of arms, and some who disparaged " the written word " and others

1. pp. 568–72.

who denied our Lord's Divinity, or His real humanity. Others taught "sinless perfection" and that sin after baptism is unpardonable, etc., etc. The Reformers in all Europe had, therefore, to make it perfectly clear that they strove to restore and re-establish true Christianity based on Scriptural teaching and the practices of the Primitive church. We need to keep these points clearly in our mind, because the Romanists always asserted that the Reformation would not purify Christianity but abolish it. Let us also note very carefully that Rome burnt hundreds of Evangelical Christian people in France, Spain, the Netherlands and elsewhere on the lying charge that they were revolutionary Anabaptists. (See also an excellent article, by Principal Vincent Tymms, entitled "Continental Anabaptists" in the "Protestant Dictionary," pp. 288–299).

Reverting to Calvin's life-story, greater troubles loomed ahead, for the "Libertines," worldly men who desired to live as they pleased, opposed all attempts at serious constructive work. Obtaining a majority in the City Councils they eventually drove the Reformers, Calvin and Farel, from Geneva on Easter Tuesday, 1538. The ostensible charge against them was their refusal to sanction the use of unleavened bread at the Holy Communion service. "But the Reformers treated the absence of leaven as a thing indifferent in itself. It was the presence of the leaven of wickedness in the Libertines that drew forth their decision. But they were condemned and the two banished servants of CHRIST departed, rejoicing that

they were counted worthy to suffer shame for His sake."[1] Few incidents in history illustrate Christian boldness better than the courageous refusal on Calvin's part to administer the Holy Communion to men who were obviously unfit to partake of the sacred elements. He was also standing for the principle that "Church discipline must be exercised by the Church itself, represented by its office-bearers,"[2] and that the decision as to fitness to approach the Lord's Table should not rest with the city Magistrates. And so they departed, Farel to Neuchâtel and Calvin eventually to Strassburg, where the latter became Pastor of a congregation of French refugees.

The period of exile was destined to last three and a half years, during which, various events of great interest happened (Easter 1538 to Sept. 1541). This was the period of the great "Conferences" at Hagenau, Worms and Ratisbon: Calvin attended all three and again met the learned and peaceful Philip Melancthon, "the Preceptor of Germany," with whom he conferred on subjects of mutual interest, including the Lord's Supper. Owing to the belief of certain Swiss divines that he had modified his opinions, Calvin at once published from Strassburg (in 1541), his treatise "Of the Lord's Supper." But besides attending the Conferences, and daily discharging his office as Professor and preacher, he published (in 1539) a second Latin edition of his "Institutes,"[3] and

1. Wileman "Life of Calvin." p. 75.
2. Lindsay "Handbook," pp. 61–62.
3. Kidd "Con. Ref." p. 95.

in 1540 his first exegetical work, the "Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans" and also revised his kinsman Olivetan's French Bible.[1]

We marvel that Calvin performed such an amount of work for he was ever a delicate man, but he had yet a greater and more arduous task to face, for the time of his return to Geneva drew nigh. It happened thus. Great was the rejoicing in the Roman camp when it was publicly announced that the Reformers had been banished from Geneva, and before long Pope Paul III, and the expelled Bishop of Geneva, Pierre de la Baume determined to attempt the recapture of the City "for Holy Mother Church."

This particular Pope, contrary to the usual rule, made a point of surrounding himself with church dignitaries who would conciliate the Reformation churches and leaders. One of the most capable and best informed of these, Cardinal Jacques Sadoleto, Bishop of Carpentras, and withal a professed admirer of Philip Melancthon, was deputed to write a letter of appeal to Geneva.[2] The Cardinal-bishop, a former secretary of Leo X, and a leading representative of the Roman Church's *literati*, commenced his letter with a piece of the most exquisite flattery, showing how he "loved the nobleness of your city, the form of your republic, the excellence of the citizens," etc. Later he proceeded to a beautiful panegyric of holy writ, then a very fine passage about JESUS CHRIST as the sole Author of salvation, and another on Justifica-

1. Bungener "Calvin," p. 155.
2. *Ibid*, pp. 137–41.

tion by faith. Finally he endeavoured to show the glories of the one and only true church of God on earth (meaning of course the Roman church), and the duty and joy of returning to that Holy Mother (the church) from which they had departed. It was distinctly unfortunate for the excellent Cardinal that whereas he wrote this Epistle on March 18, 1539, in April the "tender and compassionate mother-church" caused to be burnt at the stake two Genevese: one of them Jean Lambert, being refused a trial by the priests.[1] Meanwhile none of the remaining Pastors of the Church at Geneva was equal to the task of replying to such an accomplished and polished opponent as Sadoleto and one name was on all lips: it was "Calvin" He it was who now stepped forward as the champion of the Reformation, and of his reply Dr. Kidd remarks "Calvin's answer contains an able defence of the Reformation which 'has hand and foot' as Luther said of it; for it was not only able, but written in a dignified and gentlemanly tone."[2] Two points made by Calvin in his reply are worthy of note.

(*a*) On Justification by Faith in CHRIST, Sadoleto admitted the principle without hesitation and Calvin follows up with the question as to what the Church has done with that doctrine in years gone by? And to the Cardinal's talk of "our pretended annihilation of works" the Reformer rightly quotes "the Catechism and Instruction which I have written for those at Geneva."

1. Bungener's "Calvin," p. 141.
2. Cont. Ref., p. 96.

(*b*) As for the Holy Communion, he seeks to establish the doctrine that "the spiritual presence of CHRIST is for all who have true faith and piety . . . . as if the *reality* of CHRIST were not that of His Spirit, far more than that of His body."[1] Abbreviating a long story, we may say that by this time it had been demonstrated that though Calvin could do without Geneva, that City could not do without Calvin. In response, therefore, to an urgent invitation of the three Councils of Geneva, warmly, almost vehemently, supported by his great friend, Martin Bucer, (south Germany's leading pastor and eventually the first Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, 1550) Calvin returned to Geneva on Sept. 13, 1541.

* * * * *

The first task our Reformer now had to accomplish was the drawing up of Ordinances for discipline and Church government. We need not deny that some of Calvin's rules were severe, but many writers have blamed him unfairly because, in some points, he used the ideas and accepted some of the customs of the century in which he lived. A learned historian[2] writes as follows :—

"Every instance quoted by modern historians to prove, as they think, Calvin's despotic interference with the details of private life, can be paralleled by reference to the police books of mediæval towns in the 15th and 16th centu-

1. Bungener, p. 144. See also p. 297.
2. Professor Lindsay "Reformation," Vol. II, p. 108.

ries. To make them the ground of accusation against Calvin is simply to plead ignorance of the whole municipal police of the later middle Ages. To say that Calvin acquiesced in or approved of such legislation is simply to show that he belonged to the sixteenth century. When towns adopted the Reformation, the spirit of civic legislation did not change, but some old regulations were allowed to lapse and fresh ones, suggested by the new ideas, took their place."

Calvins "Ordinances," or to quote their full title *Les Ordonnances ecclésiastiques de l'Eglise de Geneve,* were the work of the Reformer assisted by a committee of six persons. It was one of his conditions when he returned, that this work should be commenced immediately, for as he wrote to Farel at the time: "I declared (to the senate) that a church could not hold together unless a settled government should be agreed upon, such as is prescribed to us in the Word of God and such as was in use in the ancient church."[1] The most we can attempt in these pages is to give some slight account, a general outline of three main features of the "Ordinances" and refer readers who desire a full account elsewhere.[2] (1) Calvin's doctrine of *The Church* is quite similar to that expressed and developed in his "Institutes" (IV, 1, 4 and 9, etc), viz., That where the pure Word of God is preached and the Sacraments rightly administered there is a church of God. He forthwith develops his scheme of Church Government with its fourfold

1. Wileman's "Life of Calvin," p. 90.

2. Lindsay, Vol. II, 107–113; Kidd "Documents," pp. 629–640. Also Kidd's "Cont. Ref." pp 97–102. Bungener, pp. 179–187.

ministry, viz., Pastors, Doctors, Elders, and Deacons: the offices of the first being to Teach, Preach, and administer the Sacraments; also to govern the church, assisted by the Elders. The Doctors were to interpret the Holy Scriptures, and train new Pastors. The Deacons were to handle the finances of the church and care for the poorer members.

Every attempt was made to ensure the appointment of the best men for the various offices and to see that those thus appointed did the work of their office and did it efficiently. "Bishops," as English Church people understand the term, were abolished, but that we will note a little later. Calvin went back for precedents to the Church Fathers of the first three centuries claiming chiefly, of course, that his system and theory of Church Government was either absolutely scriptural or in line with the best practices of the Primitive Church. In some points, it has been observed, Calvin in his "Ordinances" of 1541 departed from the principles he laid down in the "Institutes" of 1536 (and revised in 1539), but we need only stop to remark that the divergence merely proves that Calvin was not the "papal dictator of Geneva" that some have depicted him: the Councils were ever ready to fight against his proposals for their "rights." Indeed it is well-known that the Council of Geneva did at some length revise the Ordinances, and its registers prove that it was not always in accordance with Calvin and his brother-pastors.[1]

1. Bungener "Calvin," p. 182.

(II) The next point dealt with is *Church Services*. These differed radically from those in vogue for centuries past. Three outstanding features may be emphasised: (1) Much more preaching and scriptural exposition, not only on Sundays but on three of the week-days were stipulated and arranged for. (2) Hymn-singing, or more correctly metrical Psalm-singing, also brightened the services. To Calvin belongs the honour of editing the first edition of Metrical Psalms for Church worship. At Strassburg in 1539 he had caused psalm cxiii to be printed in prose, and seventeen others in verse set to music. Of these metrical translations, twelve were by the Reformation Poet, Clement Marot (1497-1544: the remaining five were by Calvin himself "in whom" as Rowland Prothero remarks "the genius of philosophy had not destroyed the natural taste for poetry."[1] The number of psalms thus used was increased in 1543 and again augmented by the translations of Theodore Beza in 1548.

(3) Frequent attendance at Holy Communion was impressed upon the people. The Reformers in every country strove to correct the senseless impression, that because the Mass was abolished, there was no obligation on Christian people to remember the Lord's own command "Do this in remembrance of ME." Calvin, like our English Reformers, made excellent provision in this respect. Only ordained Ministers were to administer the Sacraments and as in the "Insti-

1. "The Psalms in Human Life," pp. 172 and 179. See also "Clement Marot" in Beza's "Icones" and Julian's "Dictionary of Hymnology."

tutes" they were two, viz., Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. At the latter Sacrament the bread was distributed by the Minister and the cup by an Elder or Deacon.

(III) *Discipline by Excommunication.* In this matter, as in others, Calvin asserts that he goes back to Scripture and the parctice of the primitive Church and that no public society can be managed without rules which must be respected if that society is not to fall to pieces. In this policy he was doubtless quite logical, though there was a weak point introduced when, in giving the Church authorities power to excommunicate stubborn law breakers, he also insisted that the Genevan Council, a purely secular power, should enforce the censures of the church. On this final point, Calvin carried comparatively few persons with him: people hated even the word "excommunication." They remembered Rome's use of the word and the practice, though Calvin's excommunication was child's play compared to Rome's ideas. Leaving aside any appeal to the secular power, we venture to maintain that almost the whole of Calvin's disciplinary rules could be proved and supported by Holy Writ and as he used to assert, the practice of the Primitive Church. To-day we have gone to the other extreme, and discipline in both Church and State would appear to be nearly as extinct as the dodo.

Calvin's life at Geneva after his return in 1541 was one of ceaseless activity, consolidating the Reformation position, preaching, and reviving his Institutes, and replying to the attacks of critics or enemies. His controversies included

one on "The Servitude and Enfranchisement of the human will" against Albert Pighius, dedicated, be it noted, to Melancthon who by no means agreed on all points with Calvin on that abstruse subject: which action on the part of the latter illustrated the friendly spirit that existed between the Reformers. He also replied to Pierre Caroli against Arianism, and to the "Nicodemites" who complained of the severity of his rule, and he vigourously repulsed Libertines and Pantheists. He also warmly controverted Jerome Bolsec who attacked the doctrines of Predestination and Reprobation. Bolsec was banished from Geneva and took his revenge some 26 years later (*i.e.* thirteen years after his opponent's death) by slandering the great Reformer.

Calvin, however, not altogether unlike Luther made his reputation not by the number of his publications but because of the undoubted intrinsic excellence of his Primary works and these included: (*a*) the Institutes, (*b*) his fine Commentaries particularly on Psalms, Job, Isaiah and Romans, the value of which for clear insight, sound exegesis, and practical with spiritual criticism will cause them ever to stand to his credit: and (*c*) his excellent Catechism. Before we draw our sketch of his life and times to a conclusion, we have yet to note three very important points.

We have already mentioned the name of Michael Servetus, and observed that after challenging Calvin to discussion at Paris in 1534, he failed to appear and take his part. Well, what about Servetus? This man was a genius

in many ways, with a bent for learning of any and every kind. He excelled as medical doctor, mathematician, and lawyer and was recently interested in theological questions. But with all his ability, he was without any sentiments which would have taught him humility. Servetus might be described in the words of one of England's greatest scholars,[1] who wrote with reference to Arius the clever and arrogant opponent of St. Athanasius at Nicaea. "He was but one of the many who were measuring the heights of heaven with their puny logic and sounding the deeps of Wisdom with the plummet of the schools." Such was the man who would persist in debating with Calvin at Geneva with reference to the Holy Trinity and other matters, notwithstanding the fact that Rome was at the very moment demanding his death as a heretic, for his Anti-Trinitarian views. He came to Geneva, having escaped from the Inquisitional prison at Vienne, and was foolish enough to remain a whole month in the metropolis of Protestantism where the doctrines of the Holy Trinity were as strenuously held as anywhere,[2] and where Servetus would meet with the greatest thinker and philosopher of the day—John Calvin. Servetus also knew perfectly well that the Reformation did not, nor could afford to, teach heresy,[3] and he knew

1. Professor H. M. Gwatkin "Arian Controversy," p. 8.

2. Kidd "Documents," p. 631.

3. We have already pointed out *re* the "Anabaptists" (see page 73), that the Reformers had always to steer a middle course between these extremists on one hand and Roman superstitions on the other.

he was living in a day when everybody agreed that death by burning was a fitting penalty for heresy. He placed Calvin in an awkward position and, by his challenges, constituted him the guardian and champion of the Church's doctrine. A great debate took place between the two men and Servetus was eventually condemned to death, being burnt at the stake on October 27th, 1553. It was a cruel thing to do and Calvin rose no higher than asking, as did poor Servetus himself, that the death penalty should be by a quicker and more humane means. What are we to say about such proceedings? Only this; that Calvin was neither better nor worse that the generation in which he lived. Everybody agreed that the penalty was fitting, *e.g.* Farel, Beza, and even the kind-hearted Melancthon, and the Council of Geneva, which also refused to listen to Calvin's appeal for a milder death. The apologists of the Roman Church have actually been shocked in this matter. To think of John Calvin causing, or agreeing to, the death of a heretic; such as Servetus! The answer to Rome is not far to seek, viz., Had Rome been quicker she would have had the opportunity of burning one more heretic. As it was, Calvin was *partially* responsible for this one death, but Rome's list of burnings, not only of "heretics" but of godly and pious Christians, will never be counted in this world.

Mr. Wileman in his "Life of Calvin" sums up the matter thus:—

(1) Servetus was guilty of blasphemy, of a kind and degree which is still punishable here in England by imprisonment.

(2) The sentence was in accordance with the spirit of the age.

(3) Servetus had been sentenced by the Inquisition at Vienne, on June 17th, 1552, "to be burned alive by a slow fire."

(4) The sentence was pronounced by the Councils of Geneva, Calvin having no power either to condemn or to save him."[1]

The tombstone of Servetus bears two inscriptions to-day as follows:—

Oct. 27th, 1553, died at the stake at Champel MICHAEL SERVETUS of Villeneuve, in Aragon, born Sept. 29th, 1511.

On the other side of the same monument we read, when translated into English:—

"The respectful and grateful sons of Calvin, our great Reformer, condemning an error which was that of his time and firmly attaching themselves to liberty of conscience according to the true principles of the Reformation and the Gospel, have raised this expiatory monument. Oct. 27th, 1903."[2]

* * * * * * *

We come now to a more strictly personal view of our Reformer. Few human beings have been subjected to more hostile or unfair criticism than Calvin. Let it be distinctly understood that we do not claim perfection for him: he was neither free from error in his teaching nor without certain failings which attach, in varying

1. pp. 103–105.
2. Dr. Reyburn's "Life of Calvin," p. 190.

degrees, to all human beings. But in some quarters an attempt has been made, and not without considerable success, to depict the Reformer as a sour, sad, dictatorial person who was never happier than when he was killing joy or preaching with glee God's decree of reprobation for more than half the human beings that ever lived. That he lacked the bluff geniality and the ready fund of wit and humour possessed by Martin Luther is acknowledged by all. In approaching Calvin there is a sense of awe: here are to be found extraordinary strength of mind, unswerving courage of conviction, honesty of purpose, sincerity of motive and utter absence of self-praise. That Calvin was a strong man, a born leader, a constructive genius, and ecclesiastical statesman who held the reins with a tenacious grip, that could and did outmatch Rome herself, a thinker, debater, and writer on the deepest problems which confront the human mind, is admitted by all who have seriously studied the man and his actions.

Need we be surprised if that kind of a man was not always to be seen wearing a bland smile? A genial nature and a winning smile are grand possessions, but if we made them the sole criterion of Christian character, how many illustrious Christians would be denied their place!

On such superficial judgment we might even rule out St. Paul if we merely read II. *Corinthians* or *Galatians*: we should most certainly rule out the great Tertullian and St. Jerome, the translator of the Vulgate Bible, and St. Columba, the Apostle to the Southern Picts and forerunner of the amiable St. Aidan—and

many others. But many side-lights have been thrown on Calvin's private life which show he was a much more humane person than his enemies have represented him. Dr. Hugh Reyburn has in recent years published an excellent "Life of Calvin" and devoted a chapter to "personal characteristics,"[1] which illustrates the Reformer taking interest in ordinary subjects such as procuring situations for youths, the marriages of young people in his congregation, and various kinds of very human and domestic affairs. The absurd suggestion that Calvin had no personal friends because he did not understand friendship,[2] is refuted by the facts of the case. His devotion to William Farel and Peter Viret was only exceeded by his sincere attachment to his devoted wife, Idelette de Bure, to whom he was married but nine years (1540–49). His friendship for Melancthon was continual and when the latter died, Calvin uttered these words —"O, Philip Melancthon—for it is thou who I address, thou who now livest at the hand of GOD with CHRIST, awaiting us on high till we are gathered with thee into blessed repose—a hundred times hast thou said to me, when wearied with toil and vexation, thou didst lean thy head upon my bosom, Would to GOD, would to GOD that I might die upon that bosom! As for me, later, a hundred times have I wished that it had been granted us to be together." And to Luther in his final sickness, Calvin wrote "Oh, if I could fly towards thee and enjoy thy society, were it but for a few

1. Chapter XIX, pp. 320–26, etc.
2. Catholic Dictionary "Calvin," also some recent Anglican writers.

hours! . . . . but since that happiness is not granted to me here, soon, I hope, it will be granted to us in the Kingdom of GOD. Farewell, therefore, most illustrious man, eminent minister of CHRIST, father for ever venerable to me. May the LORD continue to direct thee by His Spirit, for the common good of His Church."[1] In his preface to the Commentary on the Psalms may also be seen the warmest tributes to Martin Bucer and other illustrious leaders in the great cause.[2] Thus it may be observed that Calvin had many friends and loved them dearly. Like the Venerable Bede, in another connection, we might conclude "*Quid Multa!*" why talk a lot about what is so easily proved!

* * * * *

Let us take another look at Calvin during the concluding years of his life. Various projects dear to his heart were by this time accomplished. He had now published Commentaries on almost the whole of the Bible and in company with the beloved and learned Theodore Beza and others, he had issued, in 1560, the "Genevan Bible" which was to be a mighty power for good during the succeeding century.

Concerning this translation Mr. H. W. Hoare writes: "Launched into publicity upon a flood tide of Protestant elation, it at once arrested attention and secured respect by the prestige of its parent city, by the renown of its sponsors, Calvin, Beza and Knox, the two former of whom were the best Biblical scholars of the day, and by

1. Bungener, pp. 152–155.
2. pp. 35 and 42.

the known character and attainments of those responsible for it as a revision. In many a house, too, it must vividly have recalled to recent exiles the hospitalities and kindnesses which, in the dark days of their adversity, had been extended to them on a foreign soil."[1]

Great was his joy when, on the 5th of June, 1559, an University was opened at Geneva with five Professors of whom Calvin was one; and Beza had the honour of being the first Rector. "This University made Geneva the intellectual and missionary centre of the Reformed faith. By May, 1564, there were 1200 junior and 300 senior students on the books."[2]

Thus our Reformer, with his singular grip of all the facts of a given situation, not only consolidated the Reformation in his own day, but made provision for the spreading of the evangel when he should have passed on to the rest that remaineth for the people of God.

And so this brave soldier of CHRIST fought on valiantly. Bereft of the wife he loved so dearly and of the three children she had borne him, he applied himself to his work for the next fifteen years and "during these later years of his life, though working so strenuously, he was an invalid with one foot in the grave."[3] After an illness of four months he passed away, lamented by all good men, on May 27th, 1564, and of him it can truly be said "He being dead yet speaketh."

1. "Our English Bible," pp. 218–223.
2. Kidd "Documents," p. 631.
3. Reyburn "Calvin," p. 332.

Various estimates of Calvin have been given, and a few may be of interest to the reader.

Ernest Renan remarks: "Calvin was one of those absolute men, cast complete in one mould, who is taken in wholly at a single glance; one letter, one action suffices to judge him . . Careless of wealth, of titles, of honours, indifferent to pomp, modest in his life, apparently humble, sacrificing everything to make others like himself. I hardly know any man, save Ignatius Loyola, who could match him in those terrible transports. It is surprising that a man who appears to us in his life and writings so unsympathetic, should have been the centre of an immense movement in his generation . . . . Lacking that deep sympathetic ardour which was one of the secrets of Luther's success, lacking the charm, the languishing tenderness of St. Francis de Sales, Calvin succeeded in an age and in a country which called for a reaction towards Christianity, simply because he was the most Christian man of his generation."[1]

* * * * *

A Roman Catholic dignitary (Canon W. Barry) says: "Calvin was the greatest of Protestant divines . . . . Luther's eloquence made him popular by its force, humour, rudeness and vulgar style. Calvin spoke to the learned at all times even when preaching before multitudes. His manner is classical: he reasons on system and has little humour. Instead of striking with a cudgel, he uses the weapons of

1. Quoted by Lindsay, "Handbook," p. 68.

a deadly logic and persuades by a teacher's authority, not by a demagogue's calling of names. Calvin never had been an ardent Catholic: but the stories told at one time about his irregulated conduct have no foundation."[1]

* * * * *

Dr. Geo. P. Fisher, Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Yale, says with reference to "Calvin the scholar":—"As a Commentator the ability of Calvin was very great . . . . He was possessed of exegetical tact which few have equalled. He had the true spirit of a scholar. He detested irrelevant talk upon a passage but unfolds its meaning in concise and pointed terms . . . . Luther seized on the main idea of a passage, but was less precise as a philological critic: the palm belongs to Luther as a translator; to Calvin as an interpreter of the word."[2]

The moving testimonies of Theodore Beza and Henry Bullinger to Calvin's marvellous capabilities and activities are well-known. We may conclude with the following extract from an excellent recent biographer of Calvin.[3]

"He put God first. In the strength of the conviction that God had chosen his task, he fought his battles and did his work. It is the crowning trait that was expressed in the declaration of the Genevan Little Council, standing under the shadow of his recent death; "God

1. Catholic Encyc., vol. III, pp. 195–198.
2. "The Reformation," pp. 202–3.
3. Prof. Williston Walker "Calvin and the Reformation," p. 444.

gave him a character of great majesty," and that must ever remain Calvin's highest claim to personal regard.

SHORT NOTES ILLUSTRATING THE MAIN DOCTRINES TAUGHT BY CALVIN.

Difficult as it was to give an adequate idea of Luther's teaching in the small compass of a few pages, it is infinitely more difficult to abbreviate Calvin's "main points." The former dealt fully with a number of leading Christian doctrines, but the latter gives us, in his "Institutes of the Christian Religion," probably the most complete "Body of Divinity" ever produced by one individual. The following outlines will at least give some idea of Calvin's main positions and possibly create fresh interest in the Continental Reformation's greatest defender.

* * * * *

I.—The Preface is addressed to the most mighty and illustrious monarch, Francis, King of the French (1536 A. D.), and the drift of it is, that Calvin originally wrote his "Institutes" that those who feel some interest in religion might be trained to true godliness. But he now presents this 'Confession' to the King "because an unjust and cruel persecution is raging against earnest and loyal Christian people throughout France. These do not go about to subvert all order and government . . . . if they did they would deserve the fire or the

gibbet." Calvin is not pleading that he may return from his brief exile . . . "as matters now are, I can be absent from my country without regret. The cause I plead is the common cause of all the godly, and therefore the very cause of CHRIST. . . . . This cause is worthy of your ear, worthy of your investigation, worthy of your throne . . . . The King's subjects need careful guidance . . . . for the heavenly oracle is infallible which has declared that "where there is no vision, the people perish."—(*Prov.* 29, 18).

"Like Paul (*Rom.* xii, 6) we claim that our doctrine should be tested by the Word of GOD and our victory is secure . . . . Our trust in CHRIST is described as arrogance, because we lean confidently on "Him whose ineffable love towards us was such that He 'spared not His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all.' (*Rom.* viii, 32, *S. John.* xvii, 3). The King, if he will inquire, will discover that "we both labour and suffer reproach because we trust in the living God," (I. *Tim.* iv, 10) . . . . Some of our persecutors are furious, "not so much for the honour of God as for the primacy of the Apostolic See and the authority of Holy Mother Church." Faith and morals are not strong points with many such because "their belly is their God and their kitchen their religion." They call our religion "new," but is it new to preach the old saying of Paul that CHRIST JESUS died for our sins and rose again for our Justification (*Rom.* iv, 25)? Protestants will stand to the death readily and boldly for these glorious truths. They say we are "opposed to the

Fathers (I mean the ancient writers of a purer age) as if the Fathers were supporters of their impiety.

Opening each quotation with the phrase 'it was a Father who said,' Calvin then gives twenty-two quotations from leading Church Fathers which clearly condemn essentially-Roman doctrines, *e. g.* Transubstantiation, Image-worship, Fasting to win the Divine favour, Clerical celibacy, etc. "All the Fathers" says he "with one heart execrated and with one mouth protested against, contaminating the Word of GOD with the subleties of sophists and involving it in the brawls of dialecticians."

Calvin then replies to the Church of Rome's assertion that "the Church is always visible and that the form of that Church is the See of the Church of Rome and its hierarchy." "We know" says he "the true Church of God by two marks, viz., the pure preaching of the Word of God and the due administration of the Sacraments." He then administers a trouncing to Mediæval Episcopacy which Calvin was, of course, clever enough to see was *not* Episcopacy but its very negation. It was, in the liberal and non-offensive meaning of the word, "Popery," for the Bishops had become mere 'Vicars' on behalf of the Bishop of Rome. He then disowns the Anabaptists and pours ridicule and scorn on the idea of Protestants wishing to overthrow Kingdoms. Let those who abuse liberty be visited with condign punishment; only let not the Gospel of God be evil spoken of because of the iniquities of evil men.

Probably Calvin hardly dared to hope that Francis I. would listen to this *Apologia*, for he concludes, "but if the whispers of the malevolent so possess your ear that the accused are to have no opportunity of pleading their cause, yet in our patience we will possess our souls and wait for the strong hand of the Lord, which doubtless will appear in its own time, both to rescue the poor from affliction and take vengeance on the despisers who are now exulting so securely.

Most illustrious King, may the Lord, the King of Kings, establish your throne in righteousness, and your sceptre in equity."

So much for Calvin's famous Preface: no Apologist of the early Church ever wielded a more facile pen. It is terribly sad to think it was lost on Francis, the King who had done so much for learning, and boasted his friendship with Erasmus. But political expediency can do wonders in the wrong direction and it was allowed to override what little religious conviction this vain monarch possessed. How different would the history of the French Reformation have been, if Francis had responded to this noble appeal as the good Elector Frederick of Saxony did to that of Luther! But Francis was not Frederick, and France now chose to drive from her borders the most learned and patriotic citizen she ever possessed; and the work of God took its course along other channels, to the irrecoverable loss of gallant France.

II.—The Object and General Contents of the "Institutes." In the prefaces to the 1545 and 1559 revisions of the work, we note the

desire of Calvin while here "treating in succession of the principal matters which are comprised in Christian philosophy" that his readers should look up texts quoted by him and consider the proofs adduced. When he thought he was "dying of quartan ague" he tells us, "the more the disorder increased, the less I spared myself in order to leave this book behind me." He was pleased to be able to revise the work as some "wicked hypocrites have circulated a rumour of my defection to the papacy." "My object in this work has been to prepare and train candidates for the sacred office (*i.e.* of the Ministry) and for the study of the sacred volume."

As already mentioned, the work which was at first merely a fair-sized booklet, became in its final form, *i.e.* the eighth Latin edition in 1559, a considerable volume of 1200 pages. Numberless editions have since then gone forth: we are using in the present work a New Translation from the Latin and the French by Henry Beveridge, Esq.[1] with Gaspar Olevian's 'Epitome of the Institutions' and an excellent essay entitled "One Hundred Aphorisms taken from the Institutes, etc." by the Rev. Wm. Pringle of Auchterarder.

Olevian divides the work into two parts, viz., (*a*) That which treats of the knowledge of God, which leads to a blessed immortality and (*b*) That which is subordinate to the former—the knowledge of ourselves.

Book I (18 Chapters) Concerning God the Father and the Creation, preservation and

1. Published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark in 1859. (2 vols.)

government of the Universe, as implied in His Omnipotence. This book contains a good deal of "Christian and Theistic Evidences," also a powerful treatment of "the manifestation of God in Holy Scripture, ch. vi.–x.", and a very full discussion of the doctrine of Divine Providence (Chs. xvi.–xviii.)

Book II (17 chapters) Concerning the knowledge of God the Redeemer in CHRIST, as first manifested to the Fathers under the Law and afterwards to us under the Gospel. Chapters I.–VI. deal fully with the "Fall of Man" which is shewn to be total and complete. Hence man must seek redemption without himself, viz., in CHRIST. The moral law is dealt with in ch. viii. and a practical exposition of the Ten Commandments. Ch. XII. shews us CHRIST JESUS as the all-sufficient Mediator and the rest of this book is devoted to our Lord's life, death, resurrection and every phase of His Redemptive work. Calvin, as a teacher of positive truth, was unsurpassed.

Book III (25 chapters) treats of the Holy Spirit which unites us to CHRIST, and of faith by which we embrace CHRIST," which brings a two-fold benefit, viz., gratuitous righteousness (Rom. VI, 23, etc.) which He imputed to us, and regeneration, which He begins in us by giving us repentance. The great doctrines of repentance, justification through the Grace of CHRIST by faith (as opposed, incidentally, to salvation by Indulgences, "Good works" and Purgatory), practical sanctification and Christian liberty, all come in for magnificent exposition in Chapters III to XVIII. The next chapter deals quite

briefly with "Christian Liberty" and the rights of conscience. Chapter XX is one of Calvin's grandest efforts. It deals with "Prayer—as a perpetual exercise of faith and the benefits to be derived from it." It contains also a noble exposition of the LORD'S Prayer, divided into six great sections. The chapter is chiefly devotional and is as helpful as Cyprian's charming booklet on the same subject (*De Oratione Dominica*). There is a searching examination of the Roman doctrine of the "Invocation of Saints" and a footnote condemning Erasmus, "who, stumbling and walking blindfold in clear light, ventures to write thus to (the Roman Cardinal) Sadoleto, 1530"; then follows a quotation proving that the great Dutch scholar had been temporising on the subject, though Scripture grants such invocation no authority whatever (*S. John* xiv. 6, etc.). Chapters XXI—XXIV deals with a subject in which Calvin, with all his undoubted genius as philosopher and theologian, maintains some positions wherein many of his admirers, past and present, are hardly able to follow him. He deals with Eternal Election, by which God has predestinated some to Salvation and others to destruction.

In Chapter XXIV he teaches that "the reprobate bring upon themselves the righteous destruction to which they are doomed." Calvin sees difficulties in his own position, but replies to objections with great force. It is unfair, as so many friends and foes have done, to take odd sentences from this eminent theologian writing on one of the deepest of all problems. It is obvious to

any observant mind that there are many human beings who readily respond to the Gospel call: others come along a difficult pathway to faith in the Son of GOD. But many, obviously, have neither part nor lot in the matter.

The ringing of the old Church bells, countless earnest appeals, and loving invitations to GOD'S house or the Christian life, the continuous exhibition of the golden rule by CHRIST'S true disciples—all fail to move some people. They neither love GOD nor wish to hear about Him or His word. Calvin sums up (only we should *really* read him in full) somewhat as follows:—

"Let us therefore hold the doctrine of the prophet, that GOD has no pleasure in the death of the sinner: that the godly may feel confident that whenever they repent GOD is ready to pardon them; and that the wicked may feel that their guilt is doubled, when they respond not to the great mercy and condescension of GOD. The mercy of GOD, therefore, will ever be ready to meet the penitent; but all the prophets and apostles clearly tell us who they are to whom repentance is given."[1]

And again, he asserts,[2] "I hold that no man approaches God unless previously influenced from above." In a word, with Calvin, as with St. Paul and St. Augustine, everything was "of Grace": election, sanctification and final attainment of the Kingdom of Heaven was all of grace and not of works or deservings.[3]

1. "Institutes III." Chapter XXIV, p. 254.
2. Chapter XXVI, p. 256.
3. Book II., Chapter III, p. 264.

In the strictest sense Predestination and Election are not of themselves Reformation doctrines: they have been vigorously discussed by the greatest minds in the Church of GOD in various ages. But the Reformation raised the discussion afresh, and Calvin—equally with Luther—asserted that his doctrines coincided with St. Paul, St. John and the greatest of the Church Fathers, St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, and that as Augustine had opposed the Pelagians on such questions as 'original righteousness,' 'Grace and its operations,' etc., so the task had fallen to the Reformers of clearing the Scriptural position of the errors of Rome on the one hand, and certain Anabaptists on the other. An adequate treatment of this subject would fill a large book and we must conclude by summing up the Reformation position:—

We have seen Luther as the great teacher of Justification by Faith in our LORD JESUS CHRIST and how GOD'S love and mercy saves us because we cannot save ourselves: that is the anthropological point of view—man's tremendous need of Divine Grace. Calvin, teaching precisely the same truth of Justification, takes the theological standpoint, emphasising GOD'S majesty, glory, and omnipotence: "What is man that Thou art mindful of him?" GOD'S marvellous condescension in choosing any of us for eternal life in CHRIST JESUS is the marvel of the Universe to John Calvin, and he dwells on this aspect of Divine truth much more than "reprobation," which he only preaches believing it to be absolutely scriptural.

Consequently we are not surprised to find

in the Institutes (Book III, Chapter XI–XV) a powerful statement of the scriptural doctrine of 'Gratuitous Justification,' which, stated quite simply, is this "By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." *Ephesians* ii. 8. (See also *St. John* i. 12, v. 24, *Acts* xiii. 38–39 etc.). Thus does Calvin assert two great truths about the doctrine that we are freely justified who believe on CHRIST JESUS as LORD, (*a*) GOD'S glory is revealed in our salvation who could not purchase it for ourselves (II *Tim.* i. 9), and (*b*) Peace of Conscience can come no more clearly than when we know that our Salvation and Eternal safety rests with Him Who hath loved us and saved us from our sins (*Galatians* ii. 20–21). This brings us to the brightest and best part of "Calvinism," viz., Assurance; but of that we will treat later.

* * * * *

Book IV. (20 chapters) concerning the Church of GOD. The eternal means, or helps, by which GOD allures us into fellowship with CHRIST and keeps us in it. This book goes into the whole question of Church Government in the most radical fashion, and purports to give us a ministry and an organisation based absolutely on New Testament principles. We who are members of the Church of England, would not of course accept all that Calvin has to offer us. In laying down what came to be known as a "Presbyterian" form of Church government, the great jurist and theologian doubtless accepted some

positions which can hardly be maintained to-day. There is, for example, a sense in which Dr. Whitney is quite correct when he says, concerning Episcopacy, "for fourteen centuries it remained the normal type of Christian organization."[1] and some will agree with Dr. Headlam, whose excellent articles on "Apostolic Succession," and also on "Episcopacy" are well worthy of thoughtful study.[2] "The establishment of Presbyterianism in the 16th century, so far as it arose from an appeal to antiquity and was not merely a reaction against existing circumstances, was really based on a false antiquarianism." and again "It is true, of course that the words 'Bishop' and 'Presbyter' are, within certain limits, interchangable in the N.T., and that the government of the local community was in the hands of a body of Presbyters. But in no sense was the government of the Church Presbyterian. It is obvious from the study of St. Paul's epistles, that behind the local bodies was the authority of the Apostles and other members of the missionary ministry, and as this passed away, the authority of the Bishop developed." For other learned expositions of this large subject readers might refer to Archbishop Bernard's essay in Chapter V of his "Introduction to the Pastoral Epistles" viz., "Bishops and Presbyters in the Primitive Church"), and Dr. Philip Schaff in his "Apostolic Christianity," Vol. II, Chapter X, viz., "The Christian Ministry," and Bishop Light-

1. "The Historic Episcopate," p. 315.
2. "Prayer Book Dictionary," by Canons Harford and Morley-Stevenson, pp. 38–42 and 313–315, etc.

foot's essay in his "Commentary on Philippians.'· But what about Calvin's statement of the position as he came face to face with it? It is briefly this, that 'the Ancient form of Government was *utterly corrupted* by the tyranny of the Papacy' (Ch. IV—V); Rome was adamant to all appeals for reform. She absolutely refused to listen to her most faithful sons in every country in Europe and was giving a presentation of 'Christianity' from which thoughtful and devoutly religious people turned with sadness and disgust. There was no Episcopacy in the sense that English people understand that term to-day.[1] It was a case of "Rome over all" and that position, let us not forget, had been usurped. Calvin brings all his logic, and his wonderful scriptural and historical knowledge, to bear on the subject and, fully convinced that Rome cannot reform even if she would, sets up a system as compact for organisation and as capable of creating enthusiasm as Rome herself. We may at this point fittingly introduce a statement by Dr. Drury, formerly Bishop of Ripon,which throws some light on the situation: "We have seen that foreign Protestants were generally unwilling to surrender the Episcopal succession, but that they had to choose between errors of doctrine and irregularity of order. They chose, and rightly, the latter alternative.

1. Dr. Headlam takes a similiar view in his Article on "Episcopacy" where he remarks (p. 315):—

"Episcopacy is a great bulwark of ordered liberty . . . . but it was overpowered and degraded by the Papacy in the 16th Century . . . . The Papacy fostered the independence of the Monastic Orders and thus the conditions were prepared which caused the Reformation.

Our position towards them seems clear. We hold as Ussher, Laud, and Cosin held that they are true parts of the visible Church, though their Orders, judged from our standpoint, are lacking in regularity. But there are no grounds for asserting that such want of regularity impairs validity."[1]

Like every strong-minded man, Calvin naturally was confident he had got almost the whole truth in the matter, but it is noteworthy that he did not condemn Episcopacy of a modified form, such as he lived to see revived in England. It is difficult to conjecture what views he would adopt were he living to-day, but the ideas of Re-union now before the Christian Churches with a modified form of Episcopacy (quite apart from any ideas of Apostolic succession in the Roman sense) would very likely meet with his warm approval. [See Appendix "A" and further notes in Chapter V.]

* * * * *

We must conclude by observing that Book IV ot the Institutes deals also with the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These are treated in a masterly and most helpful fashion and the 'Five sacraments, falsely so called' are subjected to searching criticism. Chapter XVII on 'the benefits conferred on believers by the LORD'S Supper' is very full and direct. Just as Luther's statement regarding Justification was accepted in all the Reformed Churches,

1. "English Church Teaching," p. 197.

so Calvin's doctrine of the Holy Communion has, to a great extent, been adopted in those Churches as the nearest approach to the exact meaning and significance of Holy Scripture on that most important subject. We shall refer again to this point.

It is interesting to find Calvin advocating a kind of Confirmation service for young children who have passed through a course of instruction.[1] We of the Church of England think we have precisely what is required in our Prayer Book Service. The Romish 'farce of Confirmation'[2] comes in for rough handling in this chapter, and it must be admitted that the Church of the day in this matter laid itself open to the criticism of thoughtful minds. Calvin concludes his Institutes with a chapter on Civil Government and as we should expect, maintains in theory an exact balance between the rights of the Christian corporation and those of the Civil authority. We have already pointed out that in this matter he failed to carry out his scheme of election of Ministers at Geneva: the City Council was too strong for him. Dr. T. M. Lindsay, tells us that the best illustration of Calvin's principles on this point is to be seen in the Reformed Church of France. But, reverting to the subject of Christian recognition of the Civil power, Calvinism has always stood for the highest ideals in Church and State. If it cannot claim perfection, it certainly has a record to be proud of. It is

1. Institutes, Book IV., Chapter XIX, Section 13.

2. The phrase is not too strong: see Jewel's "Apology," or such modern writers as Dr. E. L. Cutts and Canon Dyson Hague on "Confirmation."

still a mighty force in Britain, North America and in countless Mission-fields.

* * * * *

SOME OUTSTANDING POINTS IN CALVIN'S TEACHING.

We have previously observed that the doctrine of Transubstantiation (the change of the substance of bread and wine) and the Sacrifice of the Mass were the very centre of mediæval theology. The Church taught that as the Priest uttered the words 'This is My body,' the actual body of our LORD was present upon the Altar in the most literal manner. The Sacrifice of the Mass necessarily and logically followed. To deny this in the 15th and 16th centuries, meant to risk being burned to death as a heretic. Luther, we have already noted, denied this doctrine, as did all the Reformers, but he substituted the theory known as "Consubstantiation," partly based on an earlier theory of the Schoolmen.

Calvin, instead of asking what do the various Theologians say, asked a different question, viz., "What saith the Scriptures?" Some few years before, the heroic Ulrich Zwingli had dealt with the vexed question and, repelled by the gross teaching of the Church of Rome, had given expression to sentiments almost declaring that Christ was absent and not present in the Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper. Calvin, with a master's intellect, applied himself to a solution of the great problem. In his study of the N.T.

he found no reference to the Christian Minister as a sacrificing Priest (*hiereus*) and no mention of a sacrifice, except those of prayer, praise and the reasonable service of a Christian life. He noted that the Epistle to the *Hebrews* tells of the great Sacrifice on the Cross once for all; the Sacrifice of the death of CHRIST.

He also observed that Christians were bound to approach the LORD'S Table and partake of the Holy Communion, for CHRIST'S own words were "Do this in Remembrance of ME," and that they should come readily and gladly to the LORD'S own spiritual feast. From this, he advanced to the teaching that the Sacrament does not confer grace by virtue of our mere reception of it—as scholars say *ex opere operato*. It is not for the faithless and impenitent, but for the believing and penitent: "These our heavenly Father invites to Him, in order that, refreshed by communion with Him, we may ever and anon gather new vigour until we reach the heavenly immortality.[1] Thus it was that Calvin refused to give the sacred elements to persons whose lives were well known to be evil. Proceeding then, in a learned and exhaustive manner, he deals with the doctrine of the Presence of CHRIST. "The breaking of the bread" he says "is a symbol not the reality. But this being admitted, we duly infer from the exhibition of the symbol, that the thing itself is exhibited . . . . Therefore, if by the breaking of bread the LORD truly represents the partaking of His body, there ought to be no

1. Institutes, Book IV., Chapter XVII., p. 557.

doubt whatever that He truly exhibits and performs it . . . . For why does the LORD put the symbol of His body into your hands, but just to assure you that you truly partake of Him."[1] The 28th Article in our Prayer-books is very similar to Calvin's teaching when it says "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper only after a heavenly manner. And the mean whereby the Body of CHRIST is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith." Calvin's discussion of this great subject is to be found in the Institutes, Book IV, Chapter XVII with no less than fifty sub-divisions.

As to the important subject "Sacrament or Sacrifice," we conclude with a quotation from Calvin :—

"I come now to the crowning point, viz., That the sacred Supper on which the LORD left the memorial of His passion formed and engraved was taken away, hidden and destroyed when the mass was erected. While the Supper itself is a gift of God which was to be received with thanksgiving, the sacrifice of the mass pretends to give a price to GOD to be received as satisfaction. As widely as giving differs from receiving, does sacrifice differ from the sacrament of the LORD'S Supper."[2]

II. Direct access to the Throne of Grace on

1. Ibid, p. 564.

2. Institutes, Book IV., Chapter XVIII, p. 612. Readers who would read further on the Sacramental subject are referred to Lindsay "Reformation," Vol. II., p. 56–60. The late Bishop of Durham "English Church Teaching," particularly Chapter IV. and VI.

the part of every believer in Christ. This doctrine taught, of course, by all the Reformers, was more definitely stated, expounded and amplified by Calvin than any other divine of the period. Taking the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, especially Chapters VII to X, he deals with the subject of the True and Only Mediatorship of our LORD and concludes,[1] "The sum comes to this, that the honour of the priesthood was competent to none but CHRIST, because by the sacrifice of his death, he wiped away our guilt and made satisfaction for sin—See *Psalm* cx. 4, etc." That by no means leaves CHRIST'S Ministers without a great work to do; but there is a sense in which it may be most clearly stated that "their work is not His." The Priest, in the Roman sense, finds no place in the New Testament, but :—

"CHRIST is Priest alone,
He, for all believers, stands before the Throne."

Calvin outlines his conception of the Ministry in Book IV, Chapter III, and he shows in majestic language the dignity of those who are called to be leaders in CHRIST'S congregation, who preach and teach His word, administer His Sacraments and guide His people. He maintains a beautiful balance between *II Cor.* v. 5, and Epistle to *Hebrews* xiii. 17 in the above connection.

* * * * *

III. The Rights of the Laity. Calvin went further than Luther in this matter, applying the

1. Book II., Chapter XV., p. 431, etc.

principle not only to the spiritual life (as in Prayer and Confession to God direct, and the right to read and study the Holy Scriptures, etc.), but in the actual government of the Church. Hence, whenever Calvin's principles are practiced, we find the laity having a voice in the appointment of Ministers, and Elders even taking the Cup round in the Communion Service. It is quite easy to apply this principle too far: while on the other hand, a church wherein the Priest, Clergyman, or Minister is the one and only official (all the rest being critics and talkers rather than workers), seems somewhat like a regiment with a Colonel but no active soldiers. Presbyterians claim that they preserve the balance between the rights of the Minister and the rights of the People: they certainly have a fine organisation and do a great work thanks largely to the application of Calvin's doctrine of the "Rights of the Laity" in company with that of the Presbyters.

Lack of space has forbidden any treatment of the spread of Calvinistic Churches in France, the Netherlands, Scotland and more recently, in America; the subject is highly interesting.

IV. The Doctrine of Assurance. We have observed Calvin's insistence on Predestination, and also that it can scarcely be regarded as fundamental to the Reformation position (*i.e.*, in the sense that without it there would have been no Reformation). Closely related to that doctrine, and nearer to the centre of Calvinistic philosophy, is the doctrine of the believer's Assurance. Stated simply, we can grasp the outline of this great and blessed New Testament

truth thus; *Rom.* viii. 16 reads, "The Spirit Himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we (*i.e.*, believers on CHRIST) are the children of GOD." Then, I *Epis. St. John* v. 13, "These things have I written you that ye may know that ye have eternal life, even to you that believe on the name of the Son of GOD." See also *John* x. 27–29, *Phil.* i. 6. This doctrine of Assurance, based on the unfailing promises of GOD, gave the strength to "Calvinistic" doctrine: how different from the Roman theology with its meritorious "good works" and at the last an entrance into purgatory! (See I *John* i 7–9). Some may ask but does not the doctrine of Assurance produce arrogance? The answer might be two fold (*a*) It is clearly and plainly the teaching of Holy Scripture and of our LORD Himself. (*b*) In the Calvinistic theology regarding the Majesty of GOD, and also man's justification by faith in CHRIST, for His merits—and not ours—there is no room for pride. Of course, the true Christian always keeps before him I *Corinthians* x. 12–13. It is an excellent motto and a fine corrective: if we do not know it, we should do.

* * * * *

Did space permit of it, we should now emphasise Calvin's belief that it is the duty of the Church to give both secular and religious education, to provide a highly-learned Ministry, to give to every nation a Biblical translation of its own, etc. Enough has now been written to show how great was Calvin's part in the Reformation.

APPENDIX "A." CHAPTER III.

Since writing our notes on Calvin and Episcopacy, the Appeal of the Bishops Assembled at the Lambeth Conference has been issued. It should be read and studied by all sincere Christian people: Sin is uniting and godliness must unite against it. We are undoubtedly weakened by our manifold divisions. We venture to quote Sections VI. and VII, and to assert that Calvin would have rejoiced at the sight of such a manifesto.

VI.

We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of:—

The Holy Scriptures, as the record of GOD'S revelation of Himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief:

The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship in and with CHRIST:

A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit, but also the commission of CHRIST and the authority of the whole body.

VII.

May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a minis-

try? It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communions which do not possess the Episcopate. On the contrary, we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. But we submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim which we make on behalf of the Episcopate. Moreover, we would urge that it is now and will prove to be in the future, the best instrument for maintaining the unity and continuity of the Church. But we greatly desire that the office of a Bishop should be everywhere exercised in a *representative and constitutional manner*, and more truly express all that ought to be involved for the life of the Christian Family in the title of Father-in-God. Nay more, we eagerly look forward to the day when through its acceptance in a united Church we may all share in that grace which is pledged to the members of the whole body in the apostolic rite of the laying-on of hands, and in the joy and fellowship of a Eucharist in which as one Family we may together, without any doubtfulness of mind, offer to the one LORD our worship and service.

* * * * *

APPENDIX "B." CHAPTER III.

THE INQUISITION.

(This note is based on the works of Mosheim, Von Ranke, Lindsay, Kidd and Karl von Hase).

The probable founder of this wicked organisation was a Spaniard named Dominic, of Calahorra (appropriate name!). He was enthusiastic in his defence of what he believed to be right and a cruel persecutor. He is described as a zealous preacher and, in his later years, a Canon of Osma Cathedral. He died in 1221.

Inquisitorial work had gone on, with varying degrees of vigour, for centuries but the work was made more definite by Dominic. The people of Italy and South France, suffered much from the Inquisition which, in course of time, was taken up by the Dominican and Franciscan monks. These two great monastic Orders were in mediæval times what the Jesuits came to be in the post-Reformation period, viz., "the soul of the 'Church' and the projectors of all its notable enterprises."

On the 21st July, 1542, a Papal Bull was issued establishing a supreme tribunal of Inquisition in Rome, universal in its jurisdiction, and having its branches in all countries. The suggestion was made by Cardinal Caraffa, sometime Archbishop of Brindisi, who for twenty years had done his best to stop the Reformation, and who in 1555, became Pope Paul IV; (d. 1559). He was a warm admirer of cruelty as an aid to true religion! and established the Festival of St. Dominic, the great Inquisitor. This was appropriate, for Dominic and Caraffa were both born heresy-hunters. To make the triangle complete, we introduce the name of Ignatius Loyola, a Spanish nobleman who founded the Jesuit Order in 1534; this man, like Caraffa, took his ideas of living (as to extreme simplicity and self-denial) and

his extraordinary zeal for persecuting heresy from Dominic. The object in view was the extirpation of heresy throughout the world, and Caraffa drew up "the best rules he could devise" for promoting the end in view :—

I. When the faith is in question, there must be no delay; but at the slightest suspicion, rigorous measures must be resorted to with all speed.

II. No consideration to be shewn to any prince or prelate, however high his station.

III. Extreme severity is rather to be exercised against those who attempt to shield themselves under the protection of any potentate: only he who makes plenary confession shall be treated with gentleness.

IV. No one must debase himself by shewing toleration towards heretics of any kind, above all towards Calvinists.

The above Rules were made "Catholic laws" by Pope Paul III (1542) and the troubles of Protestants at once increased. The chief methods of working were (*a*) To place a penalty on any person publishing or possessing the works of heretics, *e.g.*, Luther, Calvin or Cranmer. In a little while an "Index Expurgatorius" was drawn up: a list of books to be burned or expurged, including the Bible and various commentaries on it, etc. (*b*) To question all persons who either showed less zeal than before for the Church, or let slip some remark showing Biblical reading. (*c*) The use of all kinds of devilish tortures to extract confessions; thumb-screws, racks, and the dungeon. For those who

recanted after giving considerable trouble, death might be by the sword or, such was the mercy of the Inquisition, drowning in a sack in the local river. Refusal to recant was punished by death at the stake ; though hanging in chains over a slow fire was the penalty marked out for some.

We need not extend the story: Rome's crimes in this matter have blighted GOD's fair earth. This was Rome's answer to the Reformation and yet some of our recent writers are quite shocked that certain Reformers described her as " the woman drunk with the blood of the Saints." The victims of the Inquisition in the Netherlands, France, Spain, Italy (not to lengthen the list), went into tens of thousands and that fearful institution paid Calvin the greatest compliment when it marked out his disciples as Rome's sturdiest opponents.

The Jesuits have not always been a blessing even to the Roman Church. In 1773, Clement XIV suppressed the order because " so long as it continued, it was impossible that the Church could attain to a genuine lasting peace " : on the other hand, Pius VII re-instated the Jesuits in 1804 " at the unanimous prayer of the Christian world." The " Christian world " is, of course, the Roman Church ! Verily does an Apostle say " Be not high-minded, but fear."

IV.

William Tyndale
(1484–1536).

Biblical Translator and Martyr.

Having related the story of the two leaders of the Continental Reformation, we may now turn our attention to the leading men of the movement in England.

We have chosen three representative men and from the story of their lives and activities in the cause of God, we hope to show the development and the consolidation of the great English Reformation. We shall observe that all three were scholars of the first order, earnest, patient seekers after truth and we shall find that two of them died a martyr's death, while the third was worn out with overstudy long before he had reached the allotted span of life.

* * * * *

The name of William Tyndale, the greatest Bible Translator of his day and a martyr for Christ and the Word of God, should be known in every English home. We should not be satisfied with knowing that he was "someone who lived some time ago." The man to whom, under God, we owe our beloved English Bible, must become our friend from this time forth, and we must never hesitate to describe him as one of England's foremost benefactors.

The exact details of Tyndale's early life are shrouded in mystery. He appears to have been descended from the Barons of Tyndale in Northumberland, and his father removed from those parts to Gloucestershire as the result of being on the losing side in the disastrous Wars of the Roses. Settling in the southern county under the assumed name of Hockins or Hutchins, he lived an uneventful life and in safer days ventured to be known by his proper name of Tyndale.

We then come to the question of Tyndale's birthplace—the date of his birth was probably 1484—but the actual place is still in dispute. The Gloucestershire village of North Nibley has confidently claimed him and erected a substantial monument to the memory of its distinguished villager ; but the hamlet of Slymbridge has also been regarded as having strong claims, which some who have a right to be heard in this matter are prepared to admit as "quite possible." The ancient parish of Clodock, in which these modest lines are being penned has also, through a quondam Baptist Minister, claimed the lovely sequestered Olchon Valley, near the old church of St. Beino, as the abode of William Tyndale, and of Sir John Oldcastle a century previously. We have elsewhere[1] discussed the question fully and must admit that there is not a scrap of evidence (would that there were !) for Clodock's claims. In a word Tyndale is a star in the firmament : he shines brilliantly, but of his rising we can say little.

1. "St. Clodock, British King and Martyr," see Chapters viii. and ix.

The basis of these traditions as to Tyndale's birthplace is the statement of Foxe the martyrologist in his "Acts and Monuments," where he tells us that "this blessed martyr of CHRIST, was born about the borders of Wales." It would also appear that Tyndale went to Oxford when he was little more than a child " where he increased as well in the knowledge of tongues and other liberal arts as especially in the knowledge of the Scriptures," and he later took the opportunity of " reading privily to certain students and fellows of Magdalene College some parcel of divinity, instructing them in the knowledge and truth of the scriptures." Awaiting a favourable opportunity, he eventually removed to Cambridge which University, like that of Paris, took a leading part in advancing Humanistic and Reformation studies.

He would there meet with some kindred spirits such as Thomas Bilney, who died a martyr's death in 1531, and such future leaders, Bishops and Martyrs as Thomas Cranmer and stout Hugh Latimer. Some have conjectured that Tyndale was attracted to Cambridge by the fact that the celebrated scholar Erasmus was about that time lecturing on New Testament Greek and incidentally criticising the Church of the day. This is probable, though our actual information at this point is somewhat scanty. We, however, know sufficient to state definitely that Tyndale was a warm admirer and diligent student of the works of Erasmus[1] and of Luther (contem-

1. Seebohm's " Oxford Reformers." Essay on "Erasmus."

porary accounts all depict him as an intimate friend of the latter), but he was too original a scholar to slavishly follow any leader of the liberal arts or theology.[1]

From Cambridge he departed to Gloucestershire and our next view of him, about 1520, gives us a picture of this humble-minded scholar accepting the post of pedagogue and tutor to the children of Sir John Walsh, once an "acceptable frequenter of the Court, but now living as a country gentleman in his manor-house at Little Sodbury."

Here also we find him speaking a word in season as to the truths of Holy Scripture, and quietly correcting the erroneous opinions of certain clerical visitors to Sir John's hospitable table. Soon after the commencement of the tutor's work, he busied himself with a translation of a famous Latin book by Erasmus entitled "Enchiridion militis Christiani" (The Pocket-Dagger or Manual of a Christian soldier).[2] This book may be read in Coverdale's "Fruitful Lessons," though certain controversial portions are there omitted,[3] and the more spiritual parts retained. The original contained animadversions on the Church of the day, but particularly on the system of teaching theology with little or no reference

1. Dr. W. F. Moulton's article in "Cambridge Companion to the Bible," pp. 90–91.

2. "Enchiridion" in early Greek means a hand-knife or dagger; in later times it came to signify a manual or handbook. Luther *e.g.*, published an enchiridion of eight hymns.

3. Parker Society Edition, pp. 489–529.

to Holy Writ and hiding simple truths in floods of meaningless words. But to return to William Tyndale's translation of the "Manual": it appears it was never *printed*, but a perusal of it, on the part of Sir John and Lady Walsh, was the immediate cause of the curtailment of priestly visits to the Manor House. The translator began to be looked upon with disfavour by the local clergy and little time elapsed before he was "up in front of his betters," and who they were we may pause for a moment to observe.

The County of Gloucester was at that time part of the Diocese of Worcester and produced a goodly ecclesiastical revenue, with the result that from 1497 to 1535 four Italian priests, in turn, became Bishops of the See. In 1521 one of these was appointed, named Giulio de Medici, Archbishop of Florence, who within two years after his appointment to the Bishopric of Worcester (which diocese he apparently never visited in his life), became Pope Clement VII (1523–34). Despite an unsatisfactory start in life, for which he was not responsible, he was from the Roman point of view an ideal Pope, and a diplomat of distinction. Leopold Ranke says, "Clement was himself a man of extensive information. He spoke with equal knowledge of his subject, whether that were philosophy and theology or mechanics and hydraulic architecture. In all affairs he displayed extraordinary acuteness . . . . no man could debate a point with more address."[1] As we shall refer again to Clement VII, once Bishop of Worcester, we may

1. "History of the Popes," Vol. I, 74–75; also 94–96.

note that he figured in great events as follows :—

(*a*) Defeated by Emperor Charles V. of Germany, Clement was shut up in the Castle of St. Angelo and the holy city of Rome was sacked (1527).

(*b*) He was Pope during the stirring days of the Protestant Protest (1529) and the presentation to Charles V of the Augsburg Confession—busy days for Popes were they.

(*c*) Friendly with King Henry VIII he, after subterfuges of every kind, pronounced the original marriage of Henry and Catherine of Aragon null and void (1533).

But for the moment we are chiefly interested in Clement as an absentee English Bishop. Cardinal Wolsey, owing to a complaint on the King's part, was farming the diocesan revenues and a certain Dr. Parker as Chancellor, managed the legal affairs of the diocese, which at the time, included a little heresy-hunting. This man cited Tyndale to appear before him for spreading heresy, particularly "in and about the town of Bristol," and roundly abused the scholar and "laid to my charge whereof there could be none accuser brought."[1] He was permitted to depart with a serious warning ; but a man of Tyndale's convictions can never be silent indefinitely, and we are not surprised to know that in due course he was found disparaging Papal laws as compared with Divine. But said his opponent, a learned church doctor, "*We were better to be without God's laws than the Popes.*" To such an inane suggestion, Tyndale gave the memorable reply, "*I defy the Pope and all his laws* . . . .

If God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plough to know more of the Scripture than thou doest."[2]

A declaration of this character was not long in being spread abroad and the clergy were, accordingly, more hostile than before, since the doctrine as to the wisdom of circulating the Scriptures was perfectly novel in that generation. True, Erasmus had talked airily about such a project[3] and by this time (1516) had made himself renowned by his Greek and Latin parallel New Testament: that, however, was *not* for ploughboys and the common folk. But it was the main result of the scandalously unfair replies on the part of opponents to his doctrinal assertions, that Tyndale was moved to translate the New Testament:—"Because I had perceived by experience, how that it is impossible to establish the lay-people in any truth, except the scripture were plainly laid before their eyes in their mother tongue, that they might see the process, order and meaning of the text."

John Wickliffe's effort, of 140 years previously, had been gloriously successful—in its day. That version we will not forget, was not only a work of penmanship throughout, there being no printing press, but from a scholar's point of view, even in Tyndale's day, it was not regarded as "critical" enough, being merely a translation from the old Latin M.S.S. without any help from the

1 and 2. Preface to Tyndale's "Five Books of Moses," p. 393–96.

3. H. W. Hoare's "Our English Bible," p. 127, quotes the "Exhortation of Erasmus" in his Greek New Testament concerning a Bible in the vulgar tongue.

Greek or Hebrew. Hence Tyndale spoke of a huge undertaking; the production of a vernacular Bible. He meant a new version, worked together from the vastly increased store of knowledge then accumulated and accumulating, and rendered into a good readable English, which would be understandable to all seriously-minded people.

Having made this brave resolve as in the sight of GOD, he determined to resign his post of Tutor to Sir John Walsh's children saying as he did so "Sir, I perceive I shall not be suffered to tarry long in this country, neither shall you be able, though you would, to keep me out of the hands of the spiritualty; and also what displeasure might grow thereby to you, by keeping me, GOD knoweth, for which I should be right sorry."[1]

Thus Tyndale departed and directed his steps toward London, where Cuthbert Tunstall was then Bishop. This prelate had been warmly praised by Erasmus for his patronage of learning, and Tyndale had been provided with a letter to Sir Henry Guildford, the Controller of the Royal Household. Putting the two facts together, Tyndale calculated on getting an introduction to the Bishop of London and receiving his Lordship's support in the production of his English New Testament.

He carried with him an oration of Isocrates, which, says he, "I had translated out of Greek into English," giving undeniable evidence of his rank as a classical scholar. But he had

1. "Doctrinal Treatises," p. xxi.

misjudged the Bishop as badly as Martin Luther had misjudged Pope Leo X, and the hoped-for ally soon proved to be an enemy. The Bishop gave the curt reply that "his house was full; he had more than he could well find."

His chagrin and disappointment are scarcely concealed as he tells the story of the Bishop's short-sighted refusal, and how he waited a year in London, (and found secret friends, though he does not say so for the moment), and was shocked at the evil living observable on all sides and was irresistibly borne to the conclusion, which was at once pathetic and tragic :—

"I understood at the last not only that there was no room in my Lord of London's palace to translate the New Testament, but also that there was no place to do it in all England, as experience doth now openly declare."[1]

And so he left his native land, to which he was destined never to return, and set sail for Hamburg. His kind benefactor, a certain London draper named Humfrey Munmouth, was soon arrested and imprisoned in the Tower of London. from which prison he had to beg Cardinal Wolsey's pardon for his unspeakable crime of daring to help the heretic who worked to publish an English Bible. How strange a place the world is! Kings would rise from their thrones to-day to salute, if it were possible, St. Paul or the saintly William Tyndale, who both in their day lived to "hold forth the Word of Life," and yet prison was not good enough for either of them : they were hounded to death and friends who gave

1. "Preface to the Pentateuch," p. 396.

them food regarded as criminals. We are the reapers and they were the sowers: let us be worthy in our day and generation!

Did Tyndale journey to Hamburg in the hope of meeting some Rabbi who would teach him Hebrew, or did he spend much time at Wittenberg in conference with Luther? The gentle Sir Thomas More, Tyndale's classical yet rabid opponent, suggests the latter, but that might have been to discount our Reformer as a "Lutheran heretic." We know that Tyndale had more than a working knowledge of Hebrew and it seems likely that he lived as a student at Hamburg a considerable time, owing to the generosity of the kind-hearted Humfrey Munmouth.[1] If Tyndale learned his Hebrew with a Jewish Rabbi for his teacher, he merely followed excellent precedents: so did Aquila (150 A. D.) and so did St. Jerome of the "Vulgate Bible" fame (380–400 A. D.).

In due course we find him at Cologne, where the earlier part of his manuscript was set up in type.

He purposed to remain here to see the work concluded; the intention being to print 3,000 copies for the first edition. A zealous Romanist named John Cochlæus, "the scourge of Luther," discovered some part of the secret. This man was also publishing a volume by the printer of

1. Parker Society "Biographical note," p. xxvi, takes this view and suggests that Tyndale may only have known Luther through the latter's works.: but the Rev. R. Lovett, so well known in connection with Demaus "Life of Tyndale," comes to an opposite conclusion in his R.T.S. essay.

Tyndale's New Testament, the printer's name being Peter Quentel.

All was going well until some of the workmen, having drunk more than was good for them, boasted that England would be Lutheran when they had finished their part of the programme: but their foolish boasting caused serious loss. Cochlæus procured a prohibition against the work proceeding, and both Tyndale "and the other apostate, an ex-friar Roye, who was assisting him" in the translation work, had to flee for their lives. Up the Rhine they sailed from Cologne to Worms, and there the work was produced without cessation, and with the help of generous friends of the Reformation and Biblical cause.

But not thus easily were all obstacles surmounted. It required genius to produce the translation and patient hard work to get it printed: but what about its publication and distribution? That was, in a way, the greatest and most perilous task of all. The Romish and State authorities[1] by this time were on the watch at the various seaports and it became necessary to do two things, viz., To change the size and style of the volume and to disguise the packages in which the precious books were transported from the Continent to England.

The former task was comparatively easy, but the latter was accompanied at every step with

1. That *wonderful Protestant* Henry VIII, (!) was as zealous as Cardinal Wolsey and Bishop Tunstall in attempting to stop Tyndale's work: but more of that hereafter. See Chapter v.

difficulty and extreme danger. Fortunately, for every dangerous work there are human beings ready to face any risks with even a small prospect of success, and the history of religion affords innumerable illustrations of this principle. As in France and Scotland a few decades later, so now in England there were gallant young Evangelists who risked all that the word of God might have free course. English merchants also, faithful to the promises of former days, imported and circulated Tyndale's New Testament. The story is told how that, as the danger of importation increased, the means of continuing the work of circulation became more ingenious. All sorts of mysterious packages and cases, bales and bundles, were used as the means of transit. We English people are possessed of a kind of sporting instinct, and we consequently admire with equal warmth the plucky fighter or the man who will sacrifice everything rather than give up real (as distinguished from imaginary) convictions. Long may such traits be known as "truly British" and, while they are, we shall admire the gallant little man who sacrificed home comforts and life itself, to help this England of his and ours, that the unspeakable benefits of the Word of GOD might be free to even the least of us!

It is obviously impossible to state the precise date of publication of the edition of Tyndale's famous New Testament. A man who is being hunted by the police never keeps a diary nor leaves visiting cards. We will not fail to appreciate the point that no murderer was followed up more persistently than the "arch-heretic"

who gave us our printed English Bible. But there is a date which seems perfectly clear, viz,. Sunday, February 11th, 1526, and had we lived four centuries ago in London, we might have witnessed Cardinal Wolsey going to St. Paul's, "attended by six and thirty Bishops, Abbots, and Priors to see great basketfuls of books cast into a fire, before the large crucifix at its northern gate, whilst Bishop Fisher preached his noted sermon on the occasion: and that fire contained some copies of Tyndales New Testament."[1]

"No burnt offering" so Cardinal Campeggio had written off to Wolsey after this holocaust, "could be better pleasing to GOD."[2]

Such was Rome's view of the burning!

The translator's view of his work will appear more noble and more truly Christian. Writing to his friend the martyr, John Frith, Tyndale says, "I call GOD to record that I never altered one syllable of His Word against my conscience nor would this day, if all that is in the earth, whether it be pleasure, honour, or riches, might be given me."[3]

In October, 1526, Bishop Tunstall of London, followed up the Cardinal's effort by preaching a Sermon at St. Paul's Cross in which he declared he had found 3,000 errors in the printed New Testament and the following month the Archbishop of Canterbury (Warham) issued a mandate against the Version, being wise enough to complain chiefly of the controversial notes and

1. Doctrinal Treatises, p. xxxi.
2. Hoare "Our English Bible," p. 145.
3. Doctrinal Treatises, p. lv.

introductions to each book and the " numerous pestiferous glosses." Despite these attacks of the dignitaries, the book had an excellent sale and before long the fourth edition was produced, although it was dangerous to be the owner of a copy.

Then comes the story, accepted by the Reformation Chroniclers, Foxe and Hall[1] of Bishop Tunstall's attempts to get rid of the entire stock of Tyndale's Testaments. The Bishop and certain Ministers of State were at Antwerp on important business, and in conversation with a merchant named Augustine Packington, the Bishop declared his wish to purchase every copy as yet unsold. Packington departed from his ecclesiastical acquaintance to his translator friend and said to him :—

" William, I know thou art a poor man, and hast a heap of New Testaments and books by thee for which thou hast both endangered thy friends and beggared thyself : and I have now gotten thee a merchant, which with ready money shall despatch thee of all that thou hast, if thou think it profitable. The merchant is the Bishop of London." The bargain being effected, and a huge advertisement being assured by the forthcoming destruction of the sacred book, the matter ended thus," says Foxe, " the Bishop of London had the books, Packington had the thanks, and Tyndale had the money with which he was able to publish a better edition of his Testament."

Some persons, with superfine criticism, have

1. *ibid*, p. xxxvii, *et seq.*

endeavoured to cast doubts on the story, but we are in good company in accepting it and it aptly illustrates, we think, the temper of the times and the bigotry which would either buy or burn up all opposition—if it could.

* * * * *

We do not propose to give a lengthy account of the great translator's life: those who wish to read in full can do so in the Parker Society's excellent edition "Tyndale's Doctrinal Treatises etc." in fact, we have used it as the groundwork of this narrative. There is also the very fine full account by the late Rev. R. Demaus which all should read; while Mr. Hoare's account of "Tyndale and his work" is far too good to be overlooked in this connection.[1]

Our present main purpose is to show Tyndale's great contribution towards the English Reformation. It would be easy to depict him as a drastic Reformer, a vigorous pamphleteer, a controversialist who could equal the hardest hitter among his opponents, a commentator who wrote notes quite unwelcome to the Church of Rome though almost invariably faithful to Holy Scripture: but Tyndale, despite his manifold literary activities, was a man who had an unique life work to do and he did it. Just a brief note, therefore, on the more outstanding of his extra-biblical writings:—

(*a*) "A Pathway into the Holy Scripture." This little book contains an appeal for the use of

1. "Our English Bible," chapter v.

the vernacular by all. The Author marvels that anyone should speak against such translation for public and private spiritual welfare and rightly adds, " For we have not received the gifts of God for ourselves only, or to hide them : but to bestow them unto the honouring of GOD and CHRIST and edifying of the congregation, which is the body of CHRIST." He then proceeds to a worthy defence of Justification by faith in CHRIST which he takes care to show, like Luther and Calvin, does not involve a denial of good works, but will always be accompanied by them. He maintains the balance like a true theologian (p. 15) and is at his best in showing CHRIST JESUS as true Redeemer, Mediator and Hope of His believing people ; consequently, human merit as in the sight of God is foolishness.

(*b*) " The Parable of the Wicked Mammon " (*St. Luke, Ch.* xvi.), (verses 1 to 9 : though we should remember that there were no *verses* in the Bible until 1550, when they were introduced by Robert Stephens of Paris).

The Preface to this pamphlet has numerous references to Anti-Christs, ancient and modern. The concluding words are of more than ordinary interest :—

" Some man will ask, peradventure, Why I take the labour to make this work inasmuch as they will burn it, seeing they burnt the Gospel ? I answer, In burning the new Testament they did none other thing than that I looked for : no more shall they do, if they burn me also, if it be God's will it shall be so." Referring again to the treatise which follows, he remarks " Whosoever,

therefore, readeth this, compare it unto the Scripture."

The Parable of the wicked Mammon deals with the great question of the nature of righteousness; the problem so important to all of us. "How shall a man be righteous before God?" The subject of Justification through the Grace of CHRIST by faith is fully dealt with and *practical* Christianity is emphasised by a powerful treatment of the proposition that "Faith that bringeth not forth fruit is but a dream:" yet good works cannot purchase a seat in the Kingdom of Heaven. "CHRIST our all in all and we His loyal subjects" is again the theme. We are inclined to say as we lay down this work of Tyndale's It is just like Luther on "Christian Liberty!" and many of his "Notes on Galatians"; more accurately should we say "Just like the mind of the inspired Apostle St Paul." Tyndale was a grand Christian and his grip of essential truth, with so much error and superstition about, reminds us of Milton's lines:—

"Thou shouldest be living at this hour,
England hath need of thee; . . . we are
selfish men,
Oh! raise us up, return to us again
And give us manners, virtue, freedom, power."

(*c*) "The Obedience of a Christian Man." This treatise, which might almost be re-named a "Defence of the Reformation," had a wide circulation and like Tyndale's greatest work (the New Testament) roused the anger and fierce opposition of the Bishops and Clergy. He opens with a lengthy and almost fiery Preface, in which

he blames the Church for following the philosophy of Aristotle and of the various schoolmen, and asserts with great force that Scripture is the testing-ground of all doctrine.

In the booklet itself, we may read a vigorous attack on "the Pope's false power" and an assertion of the need of Church Government in accord with Divine principles. Some highly practical pages follow on the ruling powers of a father, husband, master and even landlords who are "not to raise the rent unduly." The rights of Kings and Judges are then dealt with in loyal fashion. Then are we introduced to the papal Anti-Christ and a damaging criticism of Roman doings, with an appeal to "judge the tree by its fruits." From this point the whole round of the seven sacraments is traversed, the true and the false being plainly exhibited. A helpful chapter on true prayer follows and Tyndale sums up his thoughts on the subject in such telling phrases as the following:—"*Galatians, Ch.* iii. In CHRIST we are one as good as another, equally beloved and indifferently heard" (p. 296). Hence confession to the priest is not the best, or the true, way to approach God (*St. John* xiv. 6). The final division deals with the four senses of Scripture and we have a glowing appeal to remember that the *simplest sense* is nearly always the fullest and most correct."

The phraseology of this book is very strong in parts; we must needs remember that the Reformer was a soldier on a battlefield rather than an aged gentleman seated in a comfortable arm-chair. The Rev. James Ellis has done good

service in pointing out that even so good a man as the excellent Lord Chancellor, Sir Thomas More, Tyndale's great and capable opponent, uses phraseology that cannot be justified.[1] We hardly like to quote it, but Sir Thomas refers to Tyndale as " that devilish drunken soul . . . that hell-hound : " whereas it is a well established fact, that Tyndale, like Calvin, was careless of riches and lived almost in poverty to forward the work of God. This is admitted on all sides.

* * * * *

Reverting again to Tyndale's work as translator, we have observed the reception accorded to his New Testament and it is interesting to note that " between the years 1525 and 1566 no fewer than forty editions were published . . . The period from 1526 to 1534 seems to have been devoted by Tyndale in large measure to work on the Old Testament. In 1530 he published the book of Genesis . . . the other books of the Pentateuch were no doubt printed at the same press, but they are without name and date. . . . All these books are furnished with prologues and notes which are often keenly controversial. The only other Old Testament book published by Tyndale himself was a translation of Jonah (1531). He laboured however to the last. A letter is extant in which he begs for the use of his Hebrew Bible, Grammar and Dictionary, in his place of imprisonment ; and when the end came he had completed the trans-

. " William Tyndale," 73–78.

lation of nine books, Joshua–Chronicles (1536)."[1]

* * * * *

Our last glimpse of William Tyndale was a picture of the Bishop of London buying the first edition to make way for improvements in the second. Days of persecution and perpetual danger followed and from Worms, Tyndale departed to Marburg. Wolsey's spies worked assiduously to capture him and for a long time failed. He was able, nevertheless, to induce a powerful friend, Stephen Vaughan, the English envoy to plead with Henry VIII for an "open Bible"; merely a good translation without notes or introductions. This noble appeal fell on deaf ears and yet the day drew nearer when Tyndale's desire should be fulfilled, though we may be sure he never hoped for the success he was actually to attain.

The story of his arrest, imprisonment, and martyrdom is amongst the most tragic and pathetic in history. From about mid-summer 1534, he was staying with a good man named Thomas Poyntz, an English merchant in Antwerp. This fact was probably no secret to the police of that city, but "as the law stood, Tyndale could not be arrested in an Englishman's house except for some great crime."[2] Hence the question arose as to how to find some Judas to act as betrayer. A certain villain named Henry

1 "Preservation and Translation of the English Bible," Rev. Dr. Sinker, pp. 80–81, in "Cambridge Companion to the Bible."

2. R. Demaus, pp. 381–85, and 389–90.

Philips pretended to be a protestant and a friend. Poyntz, with a business man's keen penetration, suspected Philips and warned his scholarly guest against the scoundrel, but the warning proved unavailing. Knowing Tyndale occasionally went out to dine with friends, Philips waited his opportunity and Tyndale, upright and naturally free from all suspicions, walked into the trap that was set for him. The other details of arrest are as follows :—

" There was a long entry at the going-out of Poyntz's house and Philips, with feigned politeness, asked Tyndale to precede him. The latter was a small built man and the former, being quite tall, was able to point out the victim to the Officers from Brussels who were waiting on this nefarious business."[1] He was eventually taken to the Castle of Vilvorde, about 18 miles from Antwerp, where he was incarcerated for twelve months. We have already noted his appeal for his Hebrew Bible and other books. The whole letter which may be read in Demaus' ' Life of Tyndale ' reminds us forcibly of St. Paul's Second Epistle to Timothy, where the Apostle, in the final imprisonment, asks for " his cloak and especially the parchments."

The days of cruel imprisonment were now concluding, and Tyndale was eventually taken from his damp and dreary cell, tied to a stake and strangled ; his dead body being burnt to ashes : the date of this awful tragedy was the 6th of October, 1536. His last words were a prayer :—" LORD ! open the King of England's

1. Demaus, p. 390.

eyes!" His prayer was answered. In what sense do we make such an assertion?

We answer "the fullest sense," for, in 1537 the Coverdale and Matthews' Bible received Royal recognition and bore the announcement "set forth with the King's most gracious license." Because of this, as well as because of its intrinsic worth, it had a large circulation. Its circulation was also helped by the fact that it was used at first by the clergy in their obedience to the Royal injunction [of 1538] to put a copy of the English Bible in a prominent place in every church.[1]

* * * * *

Perhaps we can hardly bring our brief story to its conclusion more fittingly than by quoting a few tributes of leading scholars as to the merit of Tyndale's work as translator:—

(*a*) Spalatin, chaplain and secretary to the three Reformation Electors of Saxony, and intimate friend of Luther, has the following entry in his diary:—Herman von Busche told us that 6000 copies of the New Testament in the English tongue had been printed at Worms, and that this translation had been made by an Englishman sojourning there, with two other natives of Britain, who was so skilled in seven languages, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, English and Dutch, that whichever he might be speaking, you would think it to be his native tongue."[2]

1. Dr. W. Muir's "Our Grand Old Bible," pp. 54 and 71.
2. Parker Society Edition "Tyndale," p. 30.

Von Busche, we may add, was a pupil of the great German humanist and Hebraist Johann Reuchlin and a conjoint author of a satirical work entitled " Epistolae obscurorum virorum " (1516). Some English Authors have been tempted to reject Busche's evidence. It is pleasing, therefore, to read in Demaus an excellent defence which concludes, " The *literati* on the Continent do not dream of rejecting such evidence."[1]

(*b*) Stopford Brooke says, " William Tyndale's *Translation of the New Testament*, fixed our standard English once for all and brought it finally into every English home. Tyndale held fast to pure English . . . Of the 6000 words of the *Authorised Version*, still in a great part his translation, only 250 are not now in common use.[2]

(*c*) Prof. J. A. Froude writing on the same subject says :—" The peculiar genius—if such a word may be permitted—which breathes through it, the mingled tenderness and majesty, the Saxon simplicity, the preternatural grandeur, unequalled, unapproached in the attempted improvements of modern scholars—all are here and bear the impress of the mind of one man, William Tyndale."[3]

(*d*) Frederick Seebohm says :—The simplicity, terseness and power of the English version, to which the taste of England, after frequent wanderings, again and again returns as to its

1. Demaus " Tyndale," pp. 128–30.
2. " English Literature," pp. 58–59.
3. " History of England," Vol. iii, p. 84.

best classical model, we owe and this should not be forgotten, to the poor, persecuted but noble-minded English Reformer, William Tindal, who in his English New Testament set a type which others in completing the translation of the whole Bible loyally followed."[1]

It would be easy to add to this list of witnesses or we might point to our Authorized Version, or to the recent national monument on the Thames Embankment, but we prefer to use the concluding words of a well-informed writer, Mr. H. M. Hoare, who remarks :—" If Tyndale could come back to life, he would indeed rejoice to see how his work has stood both the fiery trial of theological vindictiveness and the yet more searching test of time. Surely when we look at that life as a whole, when we trace through its chequered scenes his unwavering persistency of purpose, his unaffected humility and self-effacement, the indomitable spirit that neither exile, nor disappointment, nor persecution could quench, the strong courage that no plots, no intrigues, no prospect of martyrdom could deflect by one hair's breadth from the path of duty, his transparent honesty and integrity, the conscientiousness and truthfulness that distinguish him as a scholar and a translator and his faithfulness even unto death to the task which he had set himself to do, the name of the " Apostle of England " can never be displaced from the proud position which it has long occupied on the roll of our great national benefactors."[2]

1. "The Era of the Protestant Revolution," pp. 215–16.
2. " Our English Bible," pp. 107–158.

V.

Thomas Cranmer

(1489–1556),

ARCHBISHOP AND MARTYR.

In our first chapter we endeavoured to show that there were conditions obtaining in the beginning of the 16th century, both in England and on the Continent, which, during a period of many decades, had been maturing in some cases and deteriorating in others, so that a Reformation was absolutely imperative. We observed the advancement of all branches of learning, as well secular as religious, and that the Roman Church found drastic reform quite impossible in spite of attempts of various kinds from nearly every quarter of Europe. It is a common error that the basis of the English Reformation was the passion of Henry VIII for another wife, and that had there been a different monarch on the throne of England, there would have been no Reformation. It takes a very wise man to state precisely what "would have been, it something else had not been." Had the Almighty seen fit to give our forefathers a king such as Francis I of France or Phillip II of Spain and the Netherlands, sending fire and sword through the land and like the latter, using the horrible Inquisition to stamp out all piety that exist-

ed apart from Rome, our story would have taken another course—and that is an excellent reason for guarding the religious liberty we to-day possess. But above all, let us clearly understand that there were many conditions which made the Reformation, throughout Western Christendom, both possible and necessary.

Let us get rid of the notion that once upon a time, one distant day, all went well with England and her Church ; that there were no disabilities and no wrongs to right, that godliness flourished naturally with peace as its twin brother, that everybody loved the Pope and all the clergy were Roman Catholics and all the Parish Churches were Roman Chapels—and the next day, King Henry VIII said " I am going to get a divorce and have another wife "—and lo ! the same week English people all became Protestants ! Many persons hold such notions to-day, as one could illustrate from conversations with visitors to our recently restored Parish Church of St. Clodock, originally founded about 520 A. D. or seventy-six years before Augustine landed in Kent. Let us, therefore, endeavour to obtain a correct idea of the actual facts of a problem which is admittedly intricate. Up to the time of Edward the Confessor (1042–66), there was little Papal interference with the old Saxon church in this land. When William the Conqueror followed up the " Norman peaceful penetration," by a military conquest, many were the changes ; and not all were in the wrong direction. Gregory VII, the famous Hildebrand, called on the Conqueror to pay homage to the See of Rome, with whose blessing the Normans

had set out. William granted a part of the Popes claims, but added "I never made a promise to pay homage. Nor do I find that it was ever performed by my predecessors to thine." This position the Pope wisely accepted—under the circumstances. In every succeeding century, we find encroachments and interference with English liberties on the part of the Papacy, and we observe that Pope Alexander III annulled the "Constitutions of Clarendon" in 1164, while Innocent III annulled "Magna Charta" in 1215: the former was intended to restrain the immunities of the clergy who refused to be tried before Civil Courts: the latter secured greater liberties and advantages to the Church of England (*Ecclesia Anglicana*), to the Barons and the nation as a whole. As the Archbishop of Canterbury, Stephen Langton, led the Barons and people in 1215, retaining our ancient freedom even at that date, so did Robert Grossetête, Bishop of Lincoln, some forty years later. This brave and capable man boldly denounced Pope Innocent IV, and his Cardinals, in a sermon preached before them at Lyons in 1250, papal exactions and patronage being the outstanding points for the English Bishop's criticism. Some feeble attempts at redress were made, but there was no vivid desire for reform worthy of the name in the Papacy.

For the time being there appeared to be no need to worry much about opposition, for it will be remembered that "the palmy days of the Papacy" were from Gregory VII (1073) to Boniface VIII, the last of the great Mediæval Popes (1303).

Each quarter of a century witnessed an increase of Papal power, and it became more and more the practice to send cases of all kinds of disputes to Rome for adjudication. How this tended to elevate the Roman Church above all others can easily be understood; but the climax was reached when, in the year 1302, Boniface issued the famous Bull "*Unam Sanctam*" in which he declared "it is absolutely essential to salvation that every human creature should be subject to the Roman Pontiff."[1] Such a declaration clearly illustrates two important points, (*a*) the arrogance of *one* Church in the world claiming to be the *whole* Church, and (*b*) the fact that such an announcement would have been meaningless had there not existed an Anti-Papal spirit. The following year witnessed the commencement of the decline of the Papacy.

But, continuing our brief story of outstanding protests against Rome's encroachments, we come to the reign of King Edward III when in the year 1351, the "Statute of Provisors" was enacted, being amplified in 1390 and thus a blow was struck at Papal Appointments in England. Almost synchronising with that Statute, another was passed and eventually enlarged, to deal with new conditions and this, known as the "Statute of Præmunire," forbade appeals to the Roman Tribunal. In 1366, Pope Urban V claimed tribute from England, which claim the King and people united in resisting, and in 1374 the immortal John Wickliffe went to Bruges as English Commissioner, to meet the Papal Ambassador for vigorous discussion on

1. Dean Gee's "Reformation Period," p. 20.

the whole question of Papal tributes and 'provisions.' The next century witnessed English people too busy with civil and industrial wars to be resisting the Papacy. Individual protests against doctrinal corruption had no effect, but the great day was destined to come at length. Thus the English Church and Nation strove to keep some measure of control in the homeland, but the Papacy was a mighty force and the battle was hard fought and wearisome. We have sufficiently illustrated our point, from which it will be seen that Henry VIII, in ejecting the Papacy, merely did *effectually* what others had endeavoured to do with but partial and temporary success. We cannot tell the story of Archbishop Cranmer's life without referring frequently to Henry VIII, and we shall not easily understand the principles of the English Reformation if we fail to put Henry's divorce in its correct setting. Let us observe, in company with a competent historian,[1] that" There are three or four separate elements in the English Reformation, which must not be confused by those who wish to understand it . . . First, there was the King's divorce, which, on both sides brought a narrow, an irritating and a personal factor into the dispute between the Crown and the Papacy. Following this, and embittered by it, was our repudiation of the papal claims and jurisdiction. Next and most important, there was the Reformation proper of the English Church in doctrine, discipline and

1. The Rev. A. Galton, who in " Our attitude towards English Roman Catholics and the Papal Court," pp. 30–50, gives a well-reasoned statement of the position.

constitution : its restoration to Catholic, primitive, scriptural, and therefore apostolic and evangelical Christianity. Depending from this, partly ecclesiastical, but much more social and political, was the dissolution of the Religious Houses and the resumption of their property."

We come now to deal with the case of Henry VIII and his connection with the Reformation and the way in which Archbishop Thomas Cranmer came to be the leading figure in that great movement in England. Henry VII had two sons, viz., Arthur and Henry. His hope was that Arthur would be his successor and that Henry junior would become a great ecclesiastic —perhaps an Archbishop or Pope. Prince Arthur, while yet a boy, was married to the daughter of Ferdinand of Spain, the Princess Catherine of Aragon, whose nephew was Charles V of Germany. But Arthur died, and forthwith Henry VII applied to Rome for a dispensation to permit of a brother marrying the deceased brother's widow. The application was made in 1503 and the following year Pope Julius II (1503–13) granted the request. This was not according to the young Prince Henry's wishes and not until the death of his father, and for State reasons, did Henry VIII enter into matrimonial alliance with Catherine in 1510. They appear to have lived happily together for nearly eighteen years but, when two infant sons died and the young Princess Mary alone was left, Henry grew disappointed that he had no male issue, and his old scruples revived. To make matters worse, a marriage was suggested between the King's daughter and a French prince,

whereupon the French ambassador raised questions as to the legitimacy of the Princess Mary. Queen Catherine was also not growing any younger and others, disgraceful to relate, were glad enough to take her place.

Henry declared that the curse of God clearly was upon the marriage for he had no son, and he applied to the Pope for what has been incorrectly called a "divorce." The Reverend Charles Hole remarks "The Church of that period rigorously prohibited divorce; yet what practically amounted to it was often enough within reach . . . a man might be able to put away his wife by a sentence of Church Law, declaring he had never been properly married at all. Thus, if divorce was impossible, a nullification of the original marriage was very far from being so: Our present law is different."[1] A much-respected churchman of recent years sums up the position in the following terse and drastic style. "What were the real motives of Henry, I know not. Whether it was conscience, or passion for another, or reasons of state, or all of them combined, others must settle. I hold no brief for Henry VIII and do not feel called upon to justify either his conduct or his character."[2] We could take up that position, but perhaps a few further remarks on a not highly savoury subject may help us, a few pages hence, when we come to the story of Cranmer the Martyr.

1. "English Church History," Chapter vi, p. 128.
2. Archdeacon W. F. Taylor, D.D., "The English Reformation," Chapter II, p. 18.

When, in 1527, the "Divorce" question really arose, Archbishops Warham and Wolsey conferred on the subject, owing to the French Ambassador's attitude. Henry now followed the matter up and " wanted the decision of the Church, inquiring if the marriage could be nullified on any Canonical grounds ? "

Rarely has a Pope been placed in such an awkward position. Unwilling to risk the friendship of England and at the same time fearing the wrath of Catherine's nephew the Emperor of Germany, (at whose hands Rome had just suffered crushing defeat), Clement VII at last allowed the suit to be tried by Cardinal Campeggio in England. Doubtless private instructions were given to bring the negotiations to a close with all convenient speed. After seven weeks discussion it fell through and the whole suit was " avoked " to Rome. Then Henry's anger fell upon the whole church. His first victim was the Lord Chancellor, Cardinal Wolsey who had so far been the King's right hand : he was dismissed in September, 1529. The " divorce " was postponed, but discussion was upon the tongue of every man.[1]

We may now introduce Thomas Cranmer who had greatness thrust upon him in a most unlooked-for way. Born on the 2nd July, 1489, at Aslacton, Nottinghamshire, his father being Thomas Cranmer, Esq., a gentleman of right ancient family, whose ancestor came in with the Conqueror, was well connected both in England

1. A. D. Innes " Cranmer," pp. 38–9.

and France.[1] The youthful Thomas had a trying time at school, "the rude parish clerk giving more time to chastisement than sound teaching." He was well taught in such matters as horse riding and shooting, "oftentimes killing the deer with his cross-bow, though his sight was not perfect."[2] His father died while Thomas was a young boy: but his Mother sent him at the age of 14 years to Jesus College, Cambridge University.

Cranmer was always a diligent student and achieved a Fellowship in 1511, the year in which Erasmus began to lecture at Cambridge. It was about this time that he "instead of studying the dark riddles of Duns Scotus and other subtile questionists," tried to find the truth about salvation from Faber the Frenchman and Erasmus the Dutchman. This inquiry led him to a critical study of the latter's Greek New Testament, concerning which Strype remarks, "before he was infected with any man's opinions or errors, he applied his whole study three years therein."[3] Cranmer became a Doctor of Divinity when thirty-four years of age (1523). Marrying a gentleman's daughter, he lost his fellowship at Jesus College, but on the death of his wife and child the next year, he was re-elected and held the post some years. He refused to go to Wolsey's new college at Oxford despite a most tempting offer: others who did go soon regretted it, for some arrived at prison and death for "heresy."

1. Strype's "Memorials of Archbishop Cranmer," Vol. i, p. 2.
2. *ibid*, p. 3.
3. "Memorials," Vol. i, p. 3.

Cranmer was now appointed Examiner for the B.D. and D.D. degrees, and as such might have remained for the rest of his days in the University, but that was not to be. Oxford and Cambridge had appointed, by order of the King, six scholars each to discuss the vexed "divorce" question, and as Cranmer was not in residence at the time, another was chosen in his stead.

In addition to his more public offices, Cranmer discharged that of Tutor to two students, sons of a Mr. Cressy residing in the parish of Waltham Abbey.

An outbreak of plague rendered it prudent for Preceptor and pupils to leave Cambridge and retire to the home of the latter.

Henry VIII was then in the neighbouring forest, and two of his companions, Stephen Gardiner, afterwards Bishop of Winchester, and Lord High Almoner Foxe, afterwards Bishop of Hereford, found hospitable entertainment in the mansion house of Waltham Abbey.[1] At the supper table one evening, the conversation turned upon the burning question of the day, the royal "divorce"—more correctly, the validity or nullity of the marriage of Henry VIII and Catherine.

As the talk proceeded, the Cambridge Scholar inquired "Could not the question be decided without the excercise of Papal authority? Why go to Rome when there is a shorter road—that of the Scriptures? Why not ask the Canonists, the Divines, and the Theological Professors to return a Scripture verdict upon the

1. Beza's "Icones," p. 216.

point at issue ?[1] In a word, if the marriage with Prince Arthur's widow was contrary to the Word of God, no dispensation from the Pope could make it valid. This was to subject the Pope's decision to Holy Scripture and it involved a principle of great importance.

The King heard this and, in summoning Dr. Cranmer to his presence, remarked in forcible terms " This man, I trow, has got the right sow by the ear."[2] Cranmer received orders to lay aside all other work and draw up a treatise stating his opinions and reviewing the whole case from the standpoints of Holy Scripture, the great Church Fathers, and the early Church Councils. Nor was this all, for on the conclusion of this onerous task, he was immediately given another, viz., that of disputing the case at both Oxford and Cambridge. Needless to relate Cranmer's extensive knowledge of law, scripture and history enabled him to win a large majority of the country's greatest scholars to his view. " From an academic our doctor now became a courtier . . . prudently demeaned himself . . .and became a favourite of the nobility in general . . . and especially of the king himself."[3] In due course we find Cranmer going on a mission to the Pope, who received him with marked courtesy, for the days were difficult : and within a few months of his return, he was appointed ambassador to Charles V.

About this time the answers of the Universities to the vexed question were obtained, and

1. Ibid, p. 217. 2. Ibid, p. 219.
3. Strype's " Cranmer," Vol. i., p. 10.

Cambridge, Oxford, Paris, Padua, and even the Sorbonne, all replied by majorities that the marriage was not lawful according to God's law and no dispensation could make it so;[1] Henry acted on this and a private marriage took place between him and Anne Boleyn: the next year Elizabeth was born (1534). The Rev. Charles Hole has shewn, fully and impartially, how Convocation agreed with the Universities, and that a number of great prelates not by any means favourable to the Reformation, took Cranmer's view. We have only space to quote his concluding remarks:—

"In a word the Synods of the Church, the Universities, and Parliament of the country were virtually the Archbishop's assessors at Dunstable and spoke by his voice. If the sentence was an unrighteous one, the Church and the nation shared in the blame and two or three men ought not to be singled out as the culprits of the age . . . If in fact the act of Henry VIII in putting Catherine away was iniquitous, its discredit must be shared by the ecclesiastical system of the Middle Ages . . . the claim to abrogate a Divine law by Papal license thus brought a disastrous retribution."[2]

During the negotiations Archbishop Warham of Canterbury passed away, and Cranmer succeeded him, the Pope granting the necessary Bulls, we must presume, in ignorance of Henry's private marriage. Cranmer was consecrated Primate of all England on March 30th, 1533.

1. Taylor "English Reformation," Lecture II, p. 14.
2. "English Church History," pp. 126–132.

To get a thorough knowledge of the English Reformation, we really should, at this point, review the acts of Henry's fifth and most important Parliament. The Dean of Gloucester referring to this "Reformation Parliament," which met during the year 1529–36, remarks :— "It was to some extent 'packed' . . and in some respects not unlike the 1640 Parliament in its arbitrary methods"[1] : The same learned historian has made it possible for students to read in full the above-mentioned Acts, and having studied them, we shall not fail to note Henry's cleverness (not always untouched by sharp practice) in repressing the Clergy and how wonderfully he was used as an instrument in God's hands for forwarding a cause which in many respects he detested[2] . . . Annates, Appeals, Peter's pence, and Patronage all came under the most searching review and the most drastic treatment. The greatest event however, was the rejection of the Papal authority by the Supremacy Act, passed in November 1534, which asserted that "the King is supreme head of the Church of England and is so recognized in Convocation."[3] One of our best ecclesiastical lawyers has remarked on this point : "No doubt Henry intended to exercise the same personal authority as the Pope had done before, for the Tudors were a sturdy race and could brook no

1. "The Reformation Period," pp. 68–9.

2. Gee and Hardy's "Documents illustrative of English Church History," especially pp. 145–268. In the earlier Acts we observe the attack on abuses, where Henry was assured beforehand of the nation's support.

3. *ibid*, p. 243

opposition. But all it really meant was this, that the King was the supreme governor of all estates in his realm, whether civil or ecclesiastical."[1]

Thus the yoke, which had for so many centuries pressed so heavily on the neck of England, was broken and the burden of Papal exactions removed. This act really restored the national independence of the Church. Significantly does it remind us that she is still the English Church, *Ecclesia Anglicana*, although she has repudiated papal authority.[2]

The act also restored independence to the State, for no State can be truly free while a foreign potentate has the final authority, even in spiritual affairs. The spiritual and temporal cannot be indefinitely separated: this point was fully proved in the days of the Reformation and, as a result, the Papacy was put out of the domain of politics—*as far as possible.*

It must also be clearly understood that there were other Acts supporting the Supremacy Act, in which the authority of the Bishop of Rome was completely ruled out. One further reference must here suffice. In 1534 an Act forbidding Papal Dispensations and the Payment of Peter's Pence was passed. It contains twenty-three printed pages and its scope is noteworthy: "We are not varying from the Articles of the Catholic faith of Christendom." "If Archbishops refuse to grant the necessary licences, two Spiritual Persons can be chosen for the work by the King."

1. W. F. Taylor, LL.D., "English Reformation," p. 15
2. "Documents," p. 244.

"The King can give orders for a Visitation of the Monasteries and . . . Abbots are not to acknowledge the Pope nor pay pensions to him." "Papal licenses after March, 1533, are not to be recognized." "Statutes of Provisors and Præmunire are ready for use in cases of disobedience," etc., etc.[1]

In 1535 the Pope's name was erased from our Church Service books, and by this time there was considerable opposition, in some districts to Parliament's action. At this time two most excellent men, the aged Bishop Fisher of Rochester, and the Lord Chancellor, Sir Thomas More, were put to death; imprisoned for opposing the Succession Act (which recognised the rights of the infant princess Elizabeth) and executed under the provisions of the Treasons Act.[2] We are bound to acknowledge the fine character of both these men. They were zealous opponents of the Reformation, assisting Henry to reply to Martin Luther in 1521, and as we have seen in the previous chapter, More was Tyndale's great opponent. But all honour to them; they stood for what they believed to be right, and they died like men.

The next year was remarkable for many events in which Henry and his faithful supporter Lord Cromwell were evidently the chief actors.

The two outstanding events were the Dissolution of the Smaller Monasteries; and the publication of the Ten Articles of Religion.

1. "Documents," pp. 209–232.
2. *ibid*, pp. 247–50. This act passed in 1534 remained on the Statute Book till 1863.

As to the former event :—The King ordered a general visitation in the course of which some of the monks and nuns were found leading very dissolute lives, and deluding the people by gross imposture. At Boxley, in Kent, for example there was a famous figure of CHRIST on the Cross, which, by concealed machinery was made to move its head and eyes. Various houses boasted the possession of the girdle of the Blessed Virgin Mary . . . but eleven girdles were discovered. Canon Evan Daniel remarks that " the Act of 1536 was based upon the Visitors' report and, as a result, 380 of the smaller monasteries were suppressed."[1]

The same writer also remarks " The project of dissolving the monasteries was by no means new to the English people, having been proposed as early as the time of Henry IV (1399–1413)." We have elsewhere told the story of the dissolution of Crasswall " alien " priory, which exactly corroborates Canon Daniel's statement[2] and in the same pages we pointed out that in 1525 Cardinal Wolsey scattered the St. Frideswide's monks, using their funds to found the present Christ Church College, Oxford. So that Henry VIII followed well-known precedents.

However, continuing the story, three years later the Greater Monasteries were also dissolved. This raises the question " What happened to the ejected monks ? " The answer is, that provision, in the form of pensions ranging from £70 to £3000 of present money, was granted in

1. " Outlines of English History," pp. 117–118.
2. " St. Clodock," pp. 104 and 130.

about 8000 cases of the Monks: the pensions of the Nuns averaged £48 per annum. The remainder of the money was devoted to the founding of Grammar Schools and to the establishment of six new bishoprics including Westminster, Chester, Bristol, etc., the endowment being £100,000 in each case: also to the defence of the southern ports and other purposes of State, and without a doubt some considerable part was squandered.[1]

It is supposed that the suppression of the monasteries greatly increased mendicity; but that is a great mistake. Their tendency was rather to encourage than to check beggary.[2] Our present day attitude toward the "religious houses" is simply this, that we think the country would be a great deal better without them and we regret the multiplication of Roman and Anglican monasteries in recent times. Without casting aspersions, we assert that it is impossible to have houses of this sort, which are free from all public inspection, without evils arising in them.

* * * * *

As aforesaid, in the year 1536, the Ten Articles of Religion were published. They seem to have been drawn up by a Committee of Divines

1. For a slightly different point of view see A. D. Innes "Cranmer," pp. 71–78, with which compare an excellent note by the Rev. C. Sydney Carter "English Church and the Reformation," pp. 50–52. We prefer the latter view; the subject is worthy of investigation and is deeply, if tragically, interesting.

2. Daniel's "English History," p. 118.

with the King as President and Cranmer as a leading figure. "They avoided and qualified Lutheranism, excluded Anabaptist teaching, and were as sympathetic as possible with the old learning."[1] They were transitional and as such they indicate the highest point of Henry's "protestantism." The former five articles make statements of a doctrinal character, which many of us would not accept to-day, and the latter five dealt with ceremonies which should be retained and respected: the view generally being "more Roman than Protestant and Biblical."

Strangely enough, this year also witnessed the King's order that the Bible should be printed and publicly set up in every Parish Church. These were the first "chained Bibles."

In 1537 the Ten Articles were published in the *Bishops' Book*, with the title "The Godly and Pious Institution of a Christian man." This work was performed chiefly by Cranmer and Bishop Foxe of Hereford. It contained the Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments and *Ave Maria*. It included a verbatim statement of Justification and of Purgatory from the Ten Articles, taught three Sacraments (the third being that of Penance) and an explanation of the authority of Christian Kings over all people in their dominions, subject only to the Laws of God whatsoever they be—a saving clause which was not in the 1534 Act of

1. Tutorial Prayer Book, pp.541 and 590–91, where a short outline and helpful comment by the present Bishop of Truro, may be read.

Supremacy. This, therefore, was Henry's highest protestantism. He would never have reached this great height had it not been for Cranmer and the Lord Thomas Cromwell. A second set of Royal Injunctions was issued in 1538. They gave strong support to the Reformation by an order that a large Bible should be placed in every Parish Church, and strong hints were also given against contentions over reading. Images and Candles were to be removed " except the light before the Blessed Sacrament." This year some leading Lutheran scholars came for a Conference with Cranmer and the English Reformers, but Bishops Gardiner and Tunstall, assisted by the Duke of Norfolk, tremendous opponents of the Reformation, completely upset all the plans, for they feared Christianity would be abolished.

Despite the unfortunate conclusion of the 1538 Conference, Archbishop Cranmer took the opportunity (as Dr. Jenkyns has recently proved by his discovery at the State Paper Office[1]) of drawing up some Thirteen Articles which appear to have been based on the Augsburg Confession (1530). They never received the Royal sanction, as Henry from this point to the end of his life, gave his support to more Romish and less scriptural doctrines. Cranmer is thus seen to be in a position, not altogether unlike Calvin with the Councils of Geneva, striving with partial success for the adoption of his principles, but having to accept ' half the loaf ' simply because the alternative was ' no bread at all.'

1. Maclear and Williams, " Introduction to 39 Articles," pp.12–13 ; see also "Tutorial Prayer Book," p.541.

We come now to 1539, the year of reaction, when the "Six Bloody Articles," as they were then termed, were promulgated against Cranmer's advice and against his most courageous opposition. Strype presumes, in company with Foxe, that the Documents stating Cranmer's case against the Six Articles had been lost,[2] but in recent days more information concerning this stormy and dangerous period has been recovered, and the Archbishop is proved to be a bold upholder of his opinions in the presence of Henry himself. The articles asserted as follows:—

I. That in the sacrament of the Altar, after the consecration, there remained no substance of bread and wine, but under these forms the natural body and blood of CHRIST were present.

II. That Communion in both kinds was not necessary to salvation . . . the flesh and blood of CHRIST are together in each of the kinds.

III. Priests may not marry by the law of God.

IV. Vows of chastity ought to be observed.

V. The use of private Masses ought to be continued.

VI. That auricular confession is expedient and necessary and ought to be retained in the Church.[1]

The penalties attached were:—For denying the first article, death by burning upon the first charge. For opposing any of the subsequent

1. "Memorials," Vol. i, pp. 164.
2. Strype's "Cranmer," Vol. i, pp. 160–161.

five articles, a heavy fine was inflicted and a warning given, and for a second "offence," death by hanging and all goods and property to be confiscated as in the case of felony. But that was not all, for persons who "refused to confess to the priest and to receive the blessed Sacrament" with this Romish interpretation attached thereto, could be challenged under this tyrannous Act and soon brought within its powers.[1] Clergy marrying, forfeited their goods and chattels and were sent to prison, "their women (observe the phrase) also were to have like punishment." Cranmer sent his wife to Germany among her friends.

It would appear that the Archbishop boldly denounced the Six Articles in a speech lasting the greater part of three consecutive days. Strype does not hesitate to suggest that Henry was annoyed with the Bishops of the "new learning" because they opposed his scheme for dissolving the remaining monasteries (1539) and having the money for his own use; hence the introduction of the Six Articles (also 1539).

But we venture to suggest that there may have been other causes. It is, of course, well-known that Bishop Latimer strove unsuccessfully to save Malvern Priory at this time and Henry hated opposition of any kind. Probably Bishop Gardiner's influence increased for some unknown personal reason and much more probably the Papal Bull "*Ejus qui*," drawn up in 1535 but not published until 1538, gave the "Defender

1. Gee and Hardy, pp. 303–19 and especially pp. 304 and 311.

of the Faith " furiously to think. The English monarch was there declared to have fallen from the faith and forfeited his crown. As a heretic adulterer, murderer and schismatic he was guilty of treason against his rightful Lord the Pope. He had refused to come to Rome and his kingdom was offered to France or Scotland—if they would (and could) take it. Henry therefore had good reason for showing to these " Catholic" countries that he was really quite orthodox and so he published the Act which all knew as " The Whip with six cords."

Latimer, Bishop of Worcester, the boldest preacher of the English Reformers and Shaxton, Bishop of Salisbury, resigned their Sees as a protest against the Act and were imprisoned for their courage. Severe persecutions followed and for eight years, until Henry's death, this heavy yoke was fastened on the people of England. Henry permitted of no opposition that it was possible for him to crush. With such a man, faithfulness in the past was no argument for mercy in the present. Fisher, More, Wolsey, and Thomas Cromwell all had to make room for somebody else when they had served their turn. There appears to have been but a solitary exception to the rule. The King was loyal in his affection for Cranmer throughout and saved the Archbishop from his enemies more than once. But all kinds of people suffered as the result of the passing of the " Six Articles Act," in which Henry had the Romish party's strongest support. At Smithfield, in 1540, six persons were put to death, three Protestants were burned for denying the " real presence," and three Romanists

were hanged for challenging the Royal Supremacy. They were taken to execution, one Protestant and one Romanist being bound on each hurdle. Oh! the bad old days when freedom and true liberty were scarcely understood!

Meanwhile, with a contradictoriness beyond the possibility of adequate explanation, Henry, strongly supported by Lord Cromwell and the Archbishop, allowed the publication of a Great Bible. It was published in 1539 and the second edition contained a sublime preface by Cranmer. The title page was illustrated in grand style by the famous painter, Hans Holbein, and depicted Henry presenting the *Verbum Dei* (Word of God) to the Bishops amid the applause of a crowd of citizens who shout "God save the Kynge."

The simultaneous publication of the Six Articles and of the Holy Scriptures was a contradictory line of conduct: all we can do is to state the fact and pass on, expecting further illustrations of that character and finding them as we proceed.

In 1543, having finally dispensed with and dispatched Lord Cromwell, the last Lord Chancellor of Henry's days, for he did not tolerate a successor, the king published a revision of the Bishops' Book of 1537. This book known as the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of a Christian Man" or the King's Book, was less favourable to the Reformation, although it stipulated for the reading of a chapter of the Bible in the English language after the Te Deum and the Magnificat. A plain hint was given that no further private attempts at translation were needed and that discussions about the Bible in alehouses would

not be tolerated. The rights of National Churches were asserted, as was the theory that Bishops can be removed by the King if they fail to do their duty, and there was a doctrinal explanation of Faith, Free-will, and Good works. These were the outstanding changes of this 1543 revision.

The next year the Litany was set forth in English. It was drawn up by Cranmer, partly compiled out of the meagre offices of the kind already existing, but largely composed by himself. It was substantially what we have at present, saving that it contained a clause for the Invocation of Saints and a strong deprecation "From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, Good LORD deliver us."

This Litany was published together with some Psalms and devotions on the Passion of our LORD, etc., in 1545 as "King Henry's Primer."

In January, 1547, the King was taken seriously ill and Cranmer was sent for. The King was speechless and the Archbishop asked the King to give him a sign that he died in the faith of CHRIST. Henry pressed Cranmer's hand and expired.

"The King made a will," says Archdeacon Taylor, "by which he left £600 a year for ever for two priests of Windsor, to say Mass at his tomb daily and to meet some charitable objects which he specified. I presume he feared he might be in Purgatory a long time, and therefore he made provision for all the remedial influences of which such a place admits. If he were re-

leased sooner the benefit of the Masses would, he supposed, do good to some other sufferer."[1]

In taking our farewell of Henry VIII we may observe three advantages that English people gained by his activities :—

(*a*) He broke the power of the Papacy in England and thus made reformation possible. (*b*) He abolished the Monasteries, those " papal garrisons " which had supported many abuses and crippled Episcopal rule in England and (*c*) He put an open Bible in the Church and forbade any man to remove it. For these three things we owe him under God, a debt of gratitude. His work was preparatory, for the most part destructive of obstacles ; the constructive still lay in the future. " Henry died a firm Romanist. From all the information to hand, he renounced no distinctive doctrine of the Roman Church, save the Papal supremacy. He would tolerate no " Popery " ; but he retained all the Romanism he ever possessed."[2]

Mr. Innes remarks " In point of doctrine Henry had always been careful to proclaim himself strictly orthodox. He had taken up the cudgels against Luther ; he had won the title of Defender of the Faith ; he had no sympathy at all with heresy."[3]

The Rev. Sydney Carter, taking a similiar view, aptly quotes Henry's last appeal to the Pope on the ' divorce ' question where that monarch affirms his loyalty to the papacy.[4]

1. " Lecture on Henry VIII." p. 18.
2. *ibid*, p. 19.
3. "Cranmer," p. 82.
4. " English Church," p. 33.

As for the Church of England throughout Henry's reign, though partially reformed, she retained her continuity with the earliest times, viz., as to constitution, Episcopal: as to revenue, endowed by free benefactions under legal protection: as to doctrine, catholic, never having relinquished her adherence to the first four General Councils and the ruling of the Council of Hatfield in 680.[1]

* * * * *

Not until Henry has passed away does the *real* Archbishop Cranmer come into full view and a brighter day dawned for the Reformation in our land. The Duke of Somerset, maternal Uncle to the boy King, Edward VI, in company with Cranmer, at once inaugurated fuller change, the partnership dissolving nearly three years later with the fall of Somerset. Edward VI, the son of Henry VIII and Jane Seymour, came to the throne in 1547 and, unfortunately for the Reformers and godly people in general, only reigned six years. The Archbishop preached a remarkable sermon at the Coronation service, in which the boy-king was referred to as "a new Josiah who was to reform the worship of God, destroy idolatry, banish the Bishop of Rome and remove images from the land."[2] The young King was from the first nurtured in the Reformed faith, having the Archbishop for his god-father and two learned and pious friends of the Refor-

1. Hole's "English Church History," pp. 54 and 171. See also "A Defence of the Church of England," by the late Earl of Selborne, Chapter ii, pp. 27–35, also pp. 84–91.

2. Gee "Reformation Period," p. 131.

mation for his preceptors, viz., Dr. Richard Cox afterwards Chancellor of Oxford and Sir John Cheke, Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge. Edward VI was of a truly religious disposition and sincerely anxious to do the will of God. The Bible was his constant study and delight. We may well imagine that, under such tuition and training, he was intelligently and decidedly in favour of the Reformation.

We must now endeavour to give a brief and accurate account of proceedings that might have been narrated more easily at great length ; but we shall give references for those who desire to pursue the subjects further. One of the first acts of King, Parliament, and Convocation in the new reign was the declaration for Holy Communion in both kinds, viz., bread and wine. The Act of Parliament also declared strongly against 'revilers of the Blessed Sacrament.'[1] Another Act *repealed* the Six Articles Act of 1539 and another of Henry's reign, which forbade the English translation of the Bible, and another the "Proclamation Act," whereby the King's proclamations had hitherto had the force of law. The wretched "*De Heretico Comburendo*" Act of 1401 which had been expanded in 1414, and only partially abolished in the 25th year of Henry VIII, was now swept away and men breathed freely.[2]

The first and most helpful piece of Edwardine reform was furnished by a visitation in 1547 of

1. Gee and Hardy, pp. 322–328.

2, Gee "Reformation Period," p. 136. Hole "Reformation," pp. 175–6, and Gee and Hardy "Documents," p. 133, etc.

England and Wales by six companies of Visitors who carried with them the King's Injunctions concerning the conduct of service, and the suppression of some gross superstitions. The visitors also ordered that the parochial parson should possess and read from a book of "Homilies" or short sermons, chiefly by Cranmer and Bishop Ridley and the "Paraphrases of Erasmus" in English. The latter had been issued some years before, in Latin, for the benefit of the Clergy.[1] "The idea" says the Dean of Gloucester "was to mould by degrees a sober expression of reformed doctrine."

In 1548 an "Order of Communion" was published. It was to be used at Mass after the Priest had communicated—up to which point the Service was in Latin. Then came the Invitations, Shorter Exhortation, Comfortable words, Confession, etc., almost as we have them to-day —in English.[2]

More eventful still was the year 1549 when the Latin Mass, which had been used for some centuries in our land, was abolished and the First Book of Common Prayer in English was substituted for it. It was first used on Whit Sunday.

This was a tremendous change introducing Morning and Evening Prayer, also Holy Communion and Baptismal Services, more or less like the present use. Still it must be noted that this

1. See Strype "Cranmer," Vol. ii, p. 13, for an interesting account of the Visitation and the Visitors—some of whom were martyrs in Mary's reign.

2. Gee "Reformation Period," pp. 139–40. Also Taylor "Reformation," p. 24.

First Prayer Book of Edward VI is *not the real ancestor* of our present prayer-book. It differed in many important points as we shall presently see.

The present state of the evidence does not warrant the belief that the First Prayer Book of Edward VI was submitted to Convocation, though it appears perfectly clear that Cranmer, as the result of an appeal to all the diocesan Bishops in December 1549, had a majority with him. He then explained that " the setting forth of the book of Common Prayer was done by the whole state of the realm . . . the book was grounded upon Holy Scripture and was agreeable to the order of the primitive Church and much to the edifying of the subject."[1] Such was Cranmer's view provided the book were taken honestly and given a fair interpretation. We cannot stay to describe this prayer-book in full : an actual copy *verbatim et literatim* has been published for all to read, with a short historical introduction above the initials W.B.[2]

Some of the features of the First Prayer Book are the Altar and altarwise position of the Priest, Sacerdotal Vestments, The Supper of the Lorde and Holy Communion, commonly called the Masse. The Service of "Litany and Suffrages," Prayers for the dead in Communion and Burial Offices, Exorcism in Baptism, Invocation of the Holy Ghost (or *epiklesis*) on the bread

1. Strype " Cranmer," Vol. ii, p. 138.

2. Griffith Farran and Co., London. Both the First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI. have been issued. They are indispensable to those who wish to know all the facts and form their own conclusions.

and wine," that they may become to us the Body and Blood of CHRIST," etc.

We shall see that in 1552 the Reformers rejected the "*epiklesis*" from the Communion Service.

Next in point of time come the second set of Royal Injunctions enjoining the use of the above Prayer book and forbidding, *inter alia*, practices such as "Setting any candles on the Lord's Board at any time . . . and any counterfeiting of the Popish Mass."

But Injunctions of that character contradicted the Ordination service, and in 1550 a new Ordinal containing Forms of Ordination for Bishops, Priests and Deacons was published, Cranmer and Ridley apparently being the chief authors, as they were in the production of the 1549 Prayer Book. Let us observe the previous ancient, though not primitive, form which read :—"Take thou authority to offer sacrifice to God and to celebrate Masses for the living and for the dead ; in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen." These words were accompanied by the "*porrectio*" or delivery of the sacred vessels into the hands of the candidate for the Priesthood. The latter part (*i.e.*, the porrectio of the sacred vessels) was retained in the First Prayer Book, but with the 1550 Ordinal it read as now :—" Take thou authority to preach the Word of God and to minister the Holy Sacraments in the Congregation, where thou shalt be lawfully appointed thereunto."[1] Those who wish to read the subject discussed from the

1. See Ordination Service.

Evangelical and Protestant point of view cannot do better than consult Canon Dyson Hague's excellent manuals.[1] Since May 1st, 1550 the Church of England has had no sacrificing priests such as we find in the Church of Rome, and that is why Rome refuses Anglican Orders. The difference between Rome and England is plainly this: whereas the former does not follow Scripture, we ot the Rreformed Church of England do.

The First Prayer Book naturally excited much interest and criticism, and it was not long before the Archbishop heard some strange interpretations of the teaching and provisions of his latest effort. Bishop Stephen Gardiner of Winchester (always to be remembered as the man who introduced Cranmer to Henry VIII and eventually assisted in the attempt to stamp out the Reformation with the fire and stake) unintentionally hastened a further revision of the Prayer Book in a scriptural direction. He had just come out of the Tower prison when he attacked the Book, on the ground that, though the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass had been rejected in seventeen important particulars, which he enumerated, with a wonderful inconsistency Cranmer, and his co-workers, had left some ten places which involved the sacrificial (the Romish) idea. Gardiner went on to express his satisfaction with the First Prayer Book of Edward VI on the ground that ' touch-

1. " The Protestantism of the Prayer Book," especially Chapters iv and ix on Holy Communion and the Ordinal. Also the booklet " Confirmation," noting Chapter iii, " What it requires," etc.

ing the truth of the very presence of CHRIST'S most precious Body and Blood in the Sacrament, there was as much spoken in that book as might be desired."[1] Hence Cranmer revised the book, expunging erroneous doctrine and leaving not a trace of the Romish sacrificial idea within its compass. In 1550 the Reformers, led by Ridley and Hooper, caused stone altars to be removed and the LORD'S Table substituted. But one of the most prominent and helpful changes of the Second Prayer Book of 1552 was the introduction of the opening parts of Morning and Evening Prayer, viz., a Text of Scripture, "Dearly beloved brethren," the general Confession (which now definitely took the place of private Confession to the Priest) and the declaratory Absolution. There were other excellent points (*e. g.*, The Ten Commandments were now used in Communion Office, etc.) which we have not space to deal with here.

"W.B." in his "Historical Introduction" to the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, though interesting and informing, make a greivous error when he asserts that "the Second Liturgy of Edward VI *is not ours*: it was abolished in the first year of Queen Mary and *has never been restored*." It is difficult to reply to statements of this kind in a dignified manner, for they are simply false, and all the more regrettable as they are in the midst of a helpful and apparently dispassionate statement. Nor does it improve matters to show that Cranmer was

1. Dr. W. F. Taylor "Edward VI," p. 27, and compare Dr. B. J. Kidd "XXXIX Articles," Part ii, p. 227.

at first thoroughly satisfied with the First Book, and yet omit to state the important reasons for the revision which took place three years later. Probably Canon Daniel was correct in thinking the Second Book did not come into *general* use, for within a few months the young King died; although other historians think the opposite. Any person of ordinary intelligence can decide whether our present prayer book has for its great ancestor the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI or not. At the commencement of any complete prayer book will be found "An Act for the Uniformity of Common Prayer, etc., Primo Elizabethæ (1559)." That Act, as clearly as possible names the book which was the basis of Queen Elizabeth's prayer book, viz., The Book of Common Prayer . . . authorized by Act of Parliament holden in the 5th and 6th years of our late sovereign Lord, King Edward VI. If we read through the Act we shall observe the only changes for the time being were to be the alteration or addition of certain lessons, the form of the Litany was to be altered and corrected, and two sentences only were added in the delivery of the sacrament to the communicants and none other or otherwise.[1]

Some readers of these lines may say "But what does it matter—was not the second book a revision of the first?" We reply "Yes; it was a revision, only let it be clearly understood that the second book was published as a vast

1. See also Gee and Hardy "Documents," pp. 458–467 and for a full discussion of the Act of Uniformity and the "Ornaments Rubric." See Gee's "Reformation Period."

improvement on the first, and as a much nearer approximation to New Testament teaching. The 1552 Prayer-book (*i. e.*, the Second book) proves, beyond a peradventure, that if we were not a Reformed Church in 1549, we most certainly were three years later. The point thus to be observed is, that the very basis of our church Liturgy was a book, published by Archbishop Cranmer, with the Royal and Parliamentary sanction in 1552, which in its teaching and provisions we are bold to say was at once Catholic and Apostolic, Protestant and Reformed.

We now come to 1553, the last year of Edward's reign. It was important by virtue of the strenuous efforts of Cranmer to consolidate the Reformation position. King Edward's catechism, an excellent educational manual, was published, followed up, in May 1553, by the forty-two Articles (eventually reduced to thirty-nine in Elizabeth's reign) and the *Reformatio Legum.* Thus he intended, by means of these instruments, as supports to his excellent Second Prayer-book, to "complete respectively the devotional, the doctrinal and the disciplinary settlement of the English Church."[1]

These were amongst Cranmer's last acts for, within a little time, the youthful Edward VI fell into a decline, and passed away, praying "O Lord God, bless Thy people and save Thine inheritance. O my Lord God, defend this realm from Papistry and maintain Thy true religion, that I and Thy people may praise Thy holy name, for Thy Son JESUS CHRIST's sake. Amen.

1. Kidd "XXXIX Articles," p. 227.

Nothing could induce young Edward VI (for he was like his father and step-sisters, a regular Tudor) to realise that he had no power to appoint his successor by will. Cranmer, upon the King's tearful entreaty, signed the document nominating the Lady Jane Grey as the new Queen; though he signed last of all, and after others who were supposed to know the law,[1] Lady Jane was proclaimed on July 10th, 1553 and the Princess Mary on July 19th. Mary faithfully promised that she would make no changes, but remain satisfied with the private exercise of her own worship. How Mary kept her promise with "heretics" we all know. She at once brought Bishop Gardiner from the Tower and made him Lord Chancellor: he became to Mary what Cranmer had been to her father Henry VIII, a veritable right hand. Then the trouble commenced and the Reformers had now not only to testify concerning CHRIST, but also to suffer for His sake. A lying report concerning Cranmer and an asserted offer by him to sing Mass at the Funeral of Edward VI, stung him into making a challenge reply.

Very soon the good Archbishop and old Bishop Hugh Latimer, who for some time had resided with Cranmer at Lambeth, found themselves in the Tower prison. While some departed to the Continent, others remained behind and fearlessly defended their opinions at the risk of their lives. We are not concerned with all the wretched details of Queen Mary's broken

1. Rev. C. Hole "Manual English Church History," p. 203.
2. *ibid*, p. 204.

promises, her suppression of preaching, or her abolition of helpful and spiritual English Church Services. She was a zealous whole-hearted Romanist and in her burning of the Saints of God she followed the teaching of the Church of Rome and followed it fully. It never occurred to Queen Mary to shew kindness or consideration, for the holy Inquisition, in its first and second diabolical rules, had ordered :—

I. When the faith is in question there must be no delay, and (II) No consideration is to be shewn to any prelate however high his station (see Chap. iii). In her zeal she could not do enough to restore "the faith" and banish heresy and she longed to do it on a magnificent scale, as they were doing it in Spain and the Netherlands ! As it was, some 280 persons were put to the flames and about 60 died in prison ; one Archbishop, four Bishops, twenty-one Clergymen and the rest were of all ranks, ages, sexes and conditions. Such was the value of Romanist promises. Such was Rome's idea of government, and the sufferings in England, judged by numbers, was child's play compared with the thousands of martyrs in the Netherlands and France. No word of repentance has ever been uttered for these crimes.

It will suffice to add that, by her First Act of Repeal in 1553, Mary abolished nine Acts of Edward VI, thus restoring (contrary to promise) the *status quo* of 1547, the year of Henry VIII's death, and in 1554, her performances included the revival of the Heresy Acts of former reigns, and a second Act of Repeal which abolished eighteen Acts of Henry's and one of Edward

VI's. She welcomed the Papal legate, and was in tears because the Monastic property and the income of the chantries were beyond recovery. The years 1554–55 were passed in discussions with the Reformers and when this line of conduct proved abortive, the next was—the fire !

We have already observed that soon after Queen Mary's accession, Archbishop Cranmer was committed to the Tower prison. Some time elapsed ere he was called forth, and despatched to Oxford, in company with Ridley and Latimer. There they were called upon to debate against the scholars of the "old learning" under the presidency of Dr. Hugh Weston, a man who in his day filled such positions of distinction as those of Margaret Professor of Divinity, the Deanery of Westminster and a little later the Deanery of Windsor.[1]

In 1550, Cranmer had stated his belief concerning the Holy Communion with profundity of scriptural and patristic learning, and with commendable clarity of expression of which he was, admittedly, a master. In that book, which was republished about ten years ago,[2] with a commendatory preface by the present learned Dean of Canterbury, we may read the Archbishop's views on this great subject, viz., "The True and Catholic Doctrine and Use of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." The book is divided into five parts each dealing with a distinctive aspect of the question, which is canvassed most thoroughly. The first chapter deals with the sub-

1. Strype "Cranmer," Vol. iii, p. 68.
2. By Mr. C. J. Thynne, London.

ject which gives the book its title. The following chapters deal with "The error of transubstantiation; The manner how CHRIST is present in his holy Supper; Of the eating and drinking of the Body and Blood of our Saviour CHRIST, and the final Chapter is Of the oblation and sacrifice of our Saviour CHRIST." This excellent book was attacked by Bishop Gardiner just as the First English Prayer Book of the previous year had been: the attack and defence, neither characterised by brevity, but both obviously, from men of extraordinary learning and courage of conviction, may be read in the Parker Society's well known edition. For the moment we may take a short cut by following up the story of the Reformers at the Oxford debate. Brought from the Tower in March 8th, 1554, they had to await the disputation which opened on Saturday, April 14th. Cranmer was first called and answered with becoming modesty and learning. Ridley gave a short reply and the debate was adjourned. Not so was it with "stout Hugh Latimer," the grand old man of the English Reformation. Despite his advancing age and sufferings in prison, he answered boldly that he "had read the New Testament seven times deliberately, and yet could not find the Mass in it, neither the marrow-bones, nor the sinews of the same." The prolocutor of the Convocation thereupon became angry, and promised Bishop Latimer that he would make him change his views; but that was easier said than done. The Reformers, it is said, were not always as tolerant as they should have been. Possibly so: let us

always give them credit for two points (*a*) they were all brought up in the bosom of the Roman church, which had no conception or doctrine of liberty and (*b*) they never begged for toleration and did not ask for mercy: their one request was:—"Please test what we say by the Word of God, and only condemn us if we are contrary to that in our teaching." In the next session, Latimer complained that his memory was failing through imprisonment, and the refusal on the part of the prison authorities to grant him pen or books. He could not quote the "Fathers" as hitherto (for Latimer was not the dunce that some would have us believe), but he would rely on Holy Scripture, and for a doctrinal statement would stand by "my Lord of Canterbury's book," viz., "The True and Catholic Doctrine, etc.," to which we have just referred.[1] The disputation from this point was maintained by Ridley and Cranmer and it resolved itself into three cardinal points, cleverly selected by Gardiner, to which special attention may fittingly be called:—

I. Whether in the Sacrament of the altar, by virtue of God's word pronounced by the Priest, there is *really* present the natural body of CHRIST, conceived of the Virgin Mary, under the kinds or the appearance of bread and wine:[2] in like manner His blood?

II. Whether after the consecration there remaineth any substance of bread and wine or

1. The Parker Society's Book "Bishop Latimer's Remains," and Chap. viii of R. Demaus' "Hugh Latimer" give the whole thrilling story of the ex-Bishop of Worcester's gallant stand. Page 102 Demaus' re Latimer's learning.

2. "Sub speciebus panis et vini," Strype III., p. 104.

any other substance, but the substance of God and man ?

III. Whether in the mass there is the lively Sacrifice of the Church, which is propitiatory as well for the sins of the quick as of the dead ?

These questions have reference to three fundamental doctrines in the controversy against Rome, viz., The Real Presence, Transubstantiation and the Sacrifice of the Mass. The Reformers all declared for a Real Presence of CHRIST, but it was a real presence in the heart of the faithful recipient and not a corporeal, localised presence. To the second question they gave a definite negative reply as they did also to the third question.

[Mr. Spencer Jones, in his recent vigorous attack, entitled "The Counter-Reformation," attempts to weaken the evidential value of the Reformers' teaching by phrases such as (p. 31) "Cranmer . . . . who surrendered to Ridley . . . Ridley who was taught his divinity by Peter Martyr, the theologian of Basel." This is unfair, because it gives no idea of the amount of research work performed by Cranmer, Ridley and others. The late Bishop of Durham has told us all about Bishop Ridley's work on the "Holy Communion:" Dr. J. Harrison in his work "Whose are the Fathers ?" has shown the Reformers' knowledge of the earliest periods and Archdeacon Taylor's Notes and Translation of a famous old book entitled "De Corpore et Sanguine Domini," (Concerning the Body and Blood of the LORD) tells us as follows:—"This book is by Ratramnus (or Bertram) the monk of Corbie, France, about

840 A. D., written in reply to the first Romish statement of transubstantiation, against Paschasius Radbertus, Abbot of Corbie." Burnet II p. 197, and Mosheim II, p. 454, support the Archdeacon's statement that Ridley studied this book as he did St. Augustine, and it influenced Ridley and Cranmer. We have "De Corpore" before us as we write, and agree that the phraseology of Article XXVIII in Prayer Book and of Cranmer's Book on "True and Catholic Doctrine of Lord's Supper" bears striking resemblance to that of Bertram.

The fact is that the Reformers examined every book they could find, ancient and modern, that would throw light on the subject. It is perhaps easier to scoff at the Reformers than it is to express our indebtedness to them : but let no one be deceived as to their learning and patient research.]

Reverting to the story of the Oxford debate, for their replies Cranmer and his two episcopal colleagues suffered martyrdom, and a moment's divergence to tell the final story ot the never-to-be-forgotten Latimer and Ridley needs no apology :—

The date was October 16th, 1555, and the two "obstinate heretics," Nicholas Ridley, lately Bishop of London, and Hugh Latimer, formerly (1535–39) Bishop of Worcester, were led out to the most awful of deaths—that of burning. "Then they brought a fagot, kindled with fire, and laid the same down at Dr. Ridley's feet. To whom Master Latimer spake in this manner, "*Be of good comfort, Master Ridley and play the man. We shall this day light such a candle, by*

God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out." And so the fire was applied to the pile and as the flames approached the martyrs, Dr. Ridley prayed "*In manus tuas, Domine, commendo spiritum meum,*" and then in English, "Lord, Lord, receive my spirit." Latimer also offered similiar prayers. Some tell us we are old-fashioned for remembering these things. We answer "If Rome had repented of her evil deeds, we might be able to forget: as it is, forgetfulness would be unpardonable, for we as Protestant Churchmen are the true descendants of these Reformation heroes."

"The Bill of Charges for burning Ridley and Latimer" is still extant, as is the Bill for the burning of Cranmer. It only cost £1 5s. 2d. in the former case and 11/4 in the latter; but the real price was the overthrow of the Romish religion in England.[1]

Presumably with the ideas of extending tyranny as far as possible, and completely breaking the Archbishop's will-power so that he might deny Reformation doctrines, Cranmer was left in prison until the following March. The virtuous Queen Mary, whom some English Churchmen have recently discovered was the best of a bad bunch (i. e., the Tudor family), permitted all sorts of promises to be made to Cranmer, provided he would revoke and recant various doctrinal statements. The perfidy of the Court and of the Friars who offered the unfortunate prisoner pardon, which it was resolved never to grant, was despicable.

1. Demaus "Latimer," p. 541, and Strype, "Cranmer," Vol. iii, p. 261.

It is, of course, regrettable that Cranmer, momentarily, lost his nerve ; he was in a terrible position for a weak, delicate man. But, who, in these days, when opinions cost nothing, is capable of judging him adversely ? Mr. A. D. Innes may be quoted as an impartial critic, and his view is noteworthy. " It has been said and it seems consonant with Cranmer's character, that while he rejected the arguments of these (Roman) divines, he broke down under his need of personal affection and moral support ; for it had always been characteristic of him that he should enjoy the warmest affection from his intimates and from those of his own household.

Now his isolation told on his emotional nature : not torture, but mere unkindness, overthrew him.[1] At length the fatal day arrived, March 21st, 1556, the day of Rome's apparent triumph and Mary's revenge on the man who, as judge, had pronounced the sentence of illegitimacy upon her, some twenty-three years previously.

According to custom in heresy cases, the Archbishop was taken to St. Mary's Church, Oxford and made to stand and hear a sermon preached by a Dr. Henry Cole, Provost of Eton and a future Dean of St. Paul's. An outline of this tirade may be read in Strype's " Memorials of Cranmer " where it may be observed[2] that the chief charges were :—

(1) That Cranmer had been a great cause of alteration (i. e., of things religious) in this realm.

(2) That he had acted as judge in the " di-

1. " Cranmer and the Reformation," p. 169.
2. Vol. iii, 243–45.

vorce" of Henry VIII and Catherine. (The preacher kindly added that the prisoner had doubtless acted as judge without malice).

(3) That he had been a great setter forth ot heresy.[1]

Then came certain pious expressions that if the prisoner truly repented of the above mentioned crimes, Divine forgiveness might be granted and special strength given to face the fire: the Priests ot Oxford would also be considerate enough to say Mass and sing "Dirige." The idea of the mediæval church in burning heretics was that by punishing the body, it repentance followed, the soul might be saved in the day of the Lord—a most desperate perversion of the Apostle's teaching in I *Cor.* v. 5.

But that was only part of the wretched proceedings: the victim was now required to stand up, confess and recant publicly. Now the *real* Cranmer stepped to the front, not like a timid sheep, but like a mighty lion. His enemies were mistaking his natural nervousness for cowardice: never were men so rudely awakened, so undeceived in their lives. They could scarcely believe their own ears as the "degraded" Archbishop proceeded thus:—

"And now I come to the great thing that troubled my conscience more than anything I ever did or said in my life—the setting abroad or writing contrary to the truth. (Cranmer had

2. Not until the days of Elizabeth was "heresy" really defined, and the Canons whereby it was to be judged were outlined in the Supremacy Act of 1559. See Gee and Hardy's "Documents," p. 443 and 455.

signed more than one humiliating statement contradicting his teaching of former days). And forasmuch as my hand offended, writing contrary to my heart, my hand shall first be punished; for when I come to the stake, it shall be first burnt. As for the Pope, I refuse him as CHRIST'S enemy and Antichrist, with all his false doctrines. And as for the Sacrament, I believe as I taught in my book against the Bishop of Winchester, which teaches so true a doctrine of the Sacrament, that it shall stand at the last day before the Judgement seat of God, when the papistical doctrine contrary thereto shall be ashamed to show its face.[1]

He was at once pulled down, and dragged out of St. Mary's Church to the stake, chained thereto and the fire forthwith kindled. Faithful to his promise, he thrust his right hand and kept it there, except when wiping his face with it, that all might see it consumed before his body. He oft-times repeated the words "This unworthy right hand," and then, with the prayer "LORD JESUS, receive my spirit," he died. Let us remember that by this date, March 1556, the Pope had full ecclesiastical power in England. Parliament had been carefully packed with "the grave Catholic sort," and had received, on behalf of the Nation, the Papal pardon for all past "delinquencies."[2] Hence the Pope super-

1. Dr. Taylor's "Lecture on Queen Mary," p. 40. The book on the Sacrament referred to by Cranmer is that which we have previously mentioned. For a fuller account see Strype's "Memorials," Vol. iii, pp. 250–55.

2. For a good note on this point see Rev. Chas. Hole "English Church History," pp. 212–13.

intended Cranmer's trial and ordered the Bishop of Gloucester to represent him. Thus, as Mr. Innes rightly remarks, " It was the Pope himself who condemned Cranmer and handed him over to the secular arm. The spectacle of the Bishop of Rome passing judgement on the Metropolitan of England, *papa alterius orbis*, was impressive ; its effect on Nationalist sentiments, . . . must have been tremendous. The claim of absolute submission to Rome had never before been put forward in a shape so uncompromising and so tangible."[1]

It is fashionable now-a-days to discount the Reformation and particularly the part taken by English scholars therein. We dissociate ourselves from such an attitude and prefer to stand by the following proposition, viz., That had the conditions been different, the Englishmen would have emerged as brilliantly as either Luther or Calvin. Neither of those confessedly great men had a Henry VIII to deal with, nor such a naturally conservative people as the British, nor did our land meet with the affront of a Papal Indulgence-seller being sent direct from Rome, with pardons at a price.[2] We had our men, *e.g.*, Hugh Latimer was as popular a Reformation preacher as Luther but he had to face the opposition and imprisonment of Henry VIII, whereas Luther was defended without intermission by

1. " Cranmer and the Reformation," p. 168.

2. Dr .B. J. Kidd admits this point in his " Continental Reformation," Chapter ii, p. 15. " The Preaching of Indulgences near Wittenberg was the occasion of the Reformation. . . The Pope did not venture to issue commissions for Spain, France or England."

those grand men the good Electors of Saxony. Who can tell what a power the learned William Tyndale might have been if, instead of being hounded to death, his scholastic abilities had been given the opportunities they merited?

Let us cease to run down our own side and meanwhile thank God that the tremendous forces opposed evolved for us, under God, a conservative and Reformed church and position respected throughout the world..

As for Thomas Cranmer, he was ot the strictly academic type, his temper of the most peaceable kind, and occasionally lacking in self-reliance. But he was no coward. Witness his bold stand in 1539, during the passing of the Six Articles Act, and his bold out-spoken criticism of the "King's Book" in 1543. He risked his life on both occasions: by 1540 Henry had dispensed with five quondam friends and useful supporters. We have also noted Cranmer's boldness in disavowing the untruths concerning the Mass at the death of Edward VI and he knew perfectly well what he was risking. He also remained in England when he could have fled.but he elected to stand by his principles and face every danger for conscience' sake.[1] Notwithstanding that he wavered somewhat during his cruel imprisonment, he was as noble a martyr, as gentle and yet as brave a soul as ever lived on earth. He had his weaknesses—who has not? But they arose from the gentleness of his nature.[2] His

1. Burnet, Vol. i, p. 280. Strype I, p. 109 and Innes' "Cranmer," p. 166.

2. Taylor's "Lecture on Cranmer," p. 41,

heart never wavered and his memory will be cherished with those of Ridley, Latimer, Hooper and Ferrar as five of the noblest Bishops that ever lived, and finally died for CHRIST.

* * * *

CHIEF FEATURES OF CRANMER'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE GREAT REFORMATION MOVEMENT.

We have seen that William Tyndale's chief work was the English Bible—its translation and publication. What shall we say about Archbishop Cranmer? We could roughly sum up his work in one phrase "The English Prayer Book: its conception and production." But let us take a more detailed view.

I. Cranmer's greatest and most influential work was the production of the English Prayer Book. Was that an easy task? Is it a work of outstanding merit? Has it justified its existence? Would we like a Latin book in its place; or a different Prayer-book for each Diocese?

The work entailed must have been colossal, for it is known by every student of Liturgiology, that Cranmer and his friends searched the achives to find the best material for the devotional handbook that was yet to be. What did he use? The mediæval English Service books, particularly the old Sarum Use; Prayers were

introduced also from the old "Sacramentaries" of Pope Gelasius (492–96) and Pope Gregory the Great (596–604) especially the latter. The Roman Church in earlier days produced some good men, though few of them were really pre-eminent. These two Popes did good and lasting work in the matter of Church Services: Cranmer very wisely laid them under contribution. He also used the early Eastern liturgy of St. Chrysostom and others, and the ancient Gallican (French) services. He also borrowed from, and skilfully used, certain forms of prayer just issued by the Spanish Cardinal Quignon, and the German Archbishop, Hermann of Cologne; the Calvinistic Valerandus Pollanus and the Polish nobleman-bishop, John A'Lasko, etc. Thus in the choice of material, our good Archbishop was in the best sense of the term "truly Catholic."

It would be out of place to give a history of the Prayer Book here. Those who wish to pursue that subject can do so quite easily to-day: we name just a few leading books that might be read.[1] To understand the compiler's mind, however, it is essential that we study most carefully the Preface "Concerning the Service of the Church" (1549) and that "Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished and some retained" (1552)

1. "How we got our Prayer Book," Bishop T. W. Drury. "The Tutorial Prayer Book," Drs. Neil and Willoughby, the Bishop of Truro, and others. "Services and Service Books," Prof. Swete. "Prayer Book Dictionary," Canons Harford and Morley-Stevenson. "The Workmanship of the Prayer Book," Bishop Dowden. "The Prayer Book: History and Contents," Canon Evan Daniel. "The Protestantism of the Prayer Book," Canon Dyson Hague." The Two Liturgies," Parker Society's Publication.

probably both from Cranmer's pen and to be found in the front of the present prayer book.

Our main point just now is, that we owe our incomparable Liturgy, under God, much more to Cranmer than any other prelate. "There is no book, with the exception of the Bible itself, to which English Churchmen are so warmly attached as the Book of Common Prayer"—says Canon Daniel. "English Churchmen ought to be very thankful for the principles by which our Reformers [of whom Cranmer was chief] were guided in compiling the Book of Common Prayer. While they expelled from our worship all that savoured of error or tended to superstition, they held steadily by their purpose to break as little as possible with the worship of the past, and to preserve all that was scriptural and helpful in the older forms of devotion"—says Bishop Drury. "Something has doubtless been sacrificed to brevity, but the result has been to secure for the Church of England the most popular Service-book in Christendom"—says Professor Swete.

To quote yet once again:—"Thus died Thomas Cranmer, whose elegy sounds through the ages in the music of the English Liturgy—" says Mr. A. D. Innes of Oxford. We will observe in studying the Prayer Book that it was revised in 1662, but that no change was made which, in any way, altered the doctrinal balance of Cranmer's magnificent work.

II. The Circulation of the English Bible must also be placed largely to Cranmer's credit. Not all will readily accept such a statement, but may it not be said with truth that while Henry VIII

sanctioned the first public English Bible, Cranmer influenced him in the right direction? No one can quite "measure up" such a character as that of the iron-willed Henry, but we submit that he was swayed, now by Gardiner and then by Cranmer. The main point was to let him think that he himself was doing everything and getting all the honour, and Henry probably was, in those moods, as easy to handle as a little child. If we are wrong in our conjecture, who will solve this riddle?—In 1539 Henry publicly sanctioned (*a*) The Great Bible, for which Cranmer wrote the magnificent preface; and (*b*) the same year enacted the Six Articles Act with its frightful penalties—as great a denial of Scriptural truth as ever existed. Yes! Cranmer was the man behind the Great Bible from 1539 to the day of his death. Let his enemies blame him: we assert that he handled the most difficult persons and trying situations as only a genius of patience and quiet strength could have done.

III. The Compilation of the best-balanced and most Scriptural Holy Communion Service in existence. Cranmer was an adept in the art of weaving into the pattern of his fabric both the ancient and the modern, With equal facility he introduced portions used as "ancient" in the days of Pope Cyprian (of Carthage D. 256[1]), and by Archbishop Hermann, Cranmer's contemporary of Cologne. The subject may be studied with pleasure and profit in Bishop Drury's handbook.[2] But one illustration of Cranmer's desire

1. Dr. T. H. Bindley, p. 21. Cyprian on the "Lord's Prayer."

2. "How we got our Prayer Book," pp. 59–73.

to retain everything of importance, and yet exclude all error, may be submitted for the reader's consideration.

In the First (1549) Prayer Book there had been an "Invocation of the Holy Ghost on the Elements" called by scholastic persons "*Epiklesis*" (the Greek name for Invocation). Bishop Gardiner found, in the use of this Invocation, an argument for Transubstantiation. [As the Rev. Spencer Jones, who longs for the success of the "Counter-Reformation Movement" in England, follows the same line in his new book,[1] we do well to observe the point carefully]. The Archbishop, in publishing the Second Prayer Book (1552), struck out the "Invocation." Now notice the exquisite wording of the prayer by which it was superseded. "Grant that we receiving these Thy creatures of Bread and Wine . . . may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood." Here was a truly Catholic prayer expressing a great truth with not a tinge of unscriptural teaching about it. As a devotional office, we doubt whether the Communion Service can be much improved by present scholars. Evangelical Churchmen will not, we are sure, have the balance of doctrinal truth upset to-day.

Archbishop Cranmer also achieved a great success in the matter of the Confirmation Office. No other Protestant Reformed Church can produce anything like as good, although Calvin was not against Confirmation administered on scriptural lines. Cranmer here, as in the 1550 Ordinal

1. Pp. 26–30.

combined the ancient and modern as none other was able, in practice, to do.

IV. Cranmer preserved Episcopacy in England. This was a great thing to do. We have previously spoken with admiration of Calvin and we are not proposing to withdraw the statements then made: all we propose to say is, that if Calvin did well under new and difficult circumstances Cranmer, we think, did much better. As Churchmen, we shall be forgiven for daring to think our own side is the best and for expressing satisfaction with Cranmer's fine policy of retaining a grand, ancient form of Church Government unencumbered by Romish and Papal autocracy. Mr. Spencer Jones thinks we are bound perpetually to bow down to the ancient See of Rome.[1] He assumes the attitude of one who wishes to start all over again from the days of Sir Thomas More, whom Henry VIII slew. But we must recognise, and are bound to accept, the real facts of historical and scriptural research. By the most honest and patient investigation, Rome's claims have fallen never to rise again. Take the case of St. Peter's alleged 25 years as Pope in Rome: No student of history and scripture would accept it for one moment.[2] And, again, the over-lordship of Rome: It was all very well once upon a time, to accept the idea that she was always the "Mistress of all the Churches," but the history of the General and the Provincial Councils

1. "Counter Reformation," p. 50, etc.

2. Canon Foakes-Jackson "History of the Christian Church," pp. 242–44, and Dr. A. Plummer "Church of the Early Fathers," pp. 33, 93 and 105.

proves the position absolutely hopeless for the Roman defenders.

Well, as aforesaid, Cranmer preserved the right ideas and practices of Episcopacy and we believe we shall soon see the wisdom of his policy endorsed by our Protestant Nonconformist brethren, on the lines so clearly laid down at a recent meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, by Dr. Guy Warman, Bishop of Truro ;—

" Non-Episcopal ministries are fully acknowledged to be ministries of true spiritual reality and no one can ever again say that Anglicans deny this fact. The proposal to accept commissions from non-Episcopal bodies to minister in their churches, was a genuine act of good will and sincerity on the part of the Bishops, who desired that non-Episcopal ministers should be episcopally ordained in order that the whole Church might have a ministry acknowledged by every part. The whole Report may be searched for any support of the doctrine of the Apostolic Succession as an exclusive channel of ministerial grace. That doctrine has been frankly repudiated."[1]

A Romish theory of Episcopacy, with the Apostolic Succession ideas of Pusey and Newman attached thereto, will never be widely received to-day ; nor was it the doctrine of the Reformers.

One other word ; Cranmer's traducers are always pleased to be able to show that he was

1. Quoted from the Bishop of Truro's address on " Lambeth and Unity " at the World's Evangelical Alliance House, *vide* " The Record," October 28th, 1920. See also Appendix " A " at the end of Chapter iii.

hopelessly under the thumb of Continental Reformers and was anything but an original and courageous thinker: This point has been dealt with in connection with the Second Prayer Book, but we may observe that while the Reformed Churches on the Continent were adopting Calvinistic forms of Church Government, our Archbishop wisely retained what Dr. A. C. Headlam, with his expert knowledge, has assured us,[1] was a more primitive mode than good John Calvin's scheme. In any case we cannot minimise Cranmer's work in one direction and yet refuse him credit in the other. Cranmer had the wisdom to see that a purified and modified form of Episcopacy was what a vast majority of English people wanted, and wherever the dear old Church of England and her daughter Churches reign supreme, there we have the system of Church government which was preserved to us, under God, by the excellent and considered judgment of CHRIST'S faithful martyr Thomas Cranmer, one of our greatest Archbishops of Canterbury.[2]

V. In one other particular did Cranmer contribute to the consolidation of the Reformation in England: He drew up, in 1538, a set of Articles, following a German practice in this matter

1. Article on "Episcopacy," pp. 313–4. "Prayer Book Dictionary."

2. An excellent defence of English Episcopacy may be read in Hooker's ";Ecclesiastical Polity," Books III and V, and for a short and scholarly treatment see "English Church Teaching," Part III, Chapter iv, "The Three-fold Ministry," and Chapter v, "The Historic Episcopate,"—introducing "Why Foreign Reformers were Non-Episcopal," by Bishop Drury.

as to the form of his work. We have seen that the document was re-discovered in modern times and that it outlines the doctrines of The Unity of God, the Holy Trinity, Justification, The Use of the Sacraments, etc. The next year Henry VIII published the Six Articles, which were on the old (Romish) lines with penalties attached. On the accession of Edward VI, there was war between the old and the new ideas, and it was felt necessary that some statement of religious belief should be issued. In due course, after the Prayer Book and the Ordinal had been published, the Bishops, guided by Cranmer and Ridley, drew up 42 Articles which were signed by King Edward VI a few days before his death. In Elizabeth's reign the number of 'Articles of Religion' was eventually reduced to 39, such as we have them to-day. Cranmer's other doctrinal work was his compendious book "The True and Catholic Doctrine and Use of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper." It is worthy of diligent study to-day, and, as we read, we shall feel what a painstaking scholar the Archbishop must have been, and what an honour it is for us to be what he was, a Protestant, Evangelical Churchman who brought all his teachings to the testing-ground of Holy Scripture.

VI.

John Jewel,

Bishop of Salisbury (1522–1571).

Our Church's Great Apologist.

For our concluding biographical sketch, we now turn to the life-story of the Consolidator of the English Reformation, the famous Apologist of the Anglican Church against Rome, John Jewel, some-time Bishop of Salisbury.

Born on 24th May, 1522, at Buden in the Parish of Berinber, the present-day Berry-Narbor, North Devonshire, John Jewel was a scion of a good family, his ancestors having resided in Berinber two hundred years or more before John's arrival. The family was rich in Jewels, there being a full dozen, father and mother, included. The boy John received his earlier education at Braunton, South Molton, and the quaint old town of Barnstaple. He was taken ill with small-pox while at school, after which he was never very strong and the story of his journey through the world of scholarship is very similar to that of Calvin's life, viz., the early collapse of a body worn out with overstudy.

Going to Oxford at the age of 13 years, he eventually came under the tuition of John Parkhurst of Merton College who was quick to see Jewel's outstanding ability and even prophesied " Surely Paul's Cross will one day ring of this boy." In 1539, the youth was transferred to Corpus Christi College and his merits placed him *facile princeps* in the University lists. " In Greek, Latin, rhetoric and mathematics he excelled . . soon advancing to the study of St. Augustine, to lay in some of those stores of divinity which afterwards were so largely accumulated. . . His memory was prodigious. His conduct with all this, was so blameless and his temper so sweet, that the very enemies of his faith could not help admiring him."[1]

Moren, Dean of Corpus, a strict Romanist, said, " I should love thee, Jewel, if thou wert not a Zwinglian. In thy faith I hold thee a heretic ; but surely in thy life thou art an angel : an excellent person, but a Lutheran." This description of Jewel's theological position was not at all correct, but the story illustrates the lovable disposition with which Jewel has been credited by all his biographers. Like all accurate scholars, Jewel was a great writer, and in his controversies it was very rarely he was required to correct a quotation from the early Church Fathers or Holy Scripture.

He took his B. A. in 1540 and his M. A. some four years later, but even by this early date, his

1. Biographical Sketch : Parker Society " Jewel's Works," Vol. IV.

studies had made their mark on his delicate constitution. His former schoolmaster, John Parkhurst, had now become Rector of Cleeve, and to his clerical home Jewel apparently adjourned for his vacations from Oxford, where he was always assured of a fraternal welcome.

When Edward VI. ascended the throne (1547), a brighter day dawned for the Reformers and such eminent foreigners as Peter Martyr and Martin Bucer were installed at Oxford and Cambridge respectively, in scholastic positions of the highest honour. Martyr's Oxford lectures were attended by Jewel, who took down almost verbatim notes, in a self-taught shorthand: hence the two great men became firm friends.

There appears to be no extant note of Jewel's ordination, but a licence for preaching was granted to him in December, 1551. His journeyings to preach here and there, must have been most painful owing to his increasing lameness.

On the occasion of taking his B. D. degree, he preached a Latin sermon on *I Peter* iv. 11, in St. Mary's Church, Oxford. The main theme was, that preaching should be unto edification and that in doing this work faithfully, preachers follow on the lines of CHRIST and His Apostles.[1] All this is commonplace to-day, but it was not so in 1551, when this sermon was delivered: the chief idea with many was that the sacrificing Priest and his Mass were Central to the Christian position and all-important.

Like many delicate men, Jewel was a vigorous preacher and he possessed a style at once racy,

1. Vol. II, p. 950–964, Parker Society Edition.

pithy and argumentative. His matter was solid and eminently well-chosen: only a man steeped in learning could have produced sermons such as his always were.

In July, 1553, on the accession of Queen Mary, Jewel was at once ejected from his post at Corpus Christi college and his valedictory address was very touching, the concluding words of which we quote: "Alas! that I must speak it, as with grief I must, farewell ye studies, farewell thou seat most eminent of learning, farewell young men, farewell ye fellows, farewell my brethren, dear as my eyes are to me, farewell all, farewell."

He was now called upon to perform a most difficult and dangerous task, viz., To draw up a letter of congratulation to Queen Mary on her accession! Jewel managed to do what was required without any sacrifice of principle.

"God had in His mercy placed her at the head of affairs and given the world a right to entertain the happiest expectations, etc."

Jewel now departed from Oxford to look for his old friend Parkhurst, but, after walking miles through frost and snow, he learned the sad news that the Rector had departed in company with the Archdeacon of Gloucester, to the Continent. He returned disappointed and almost worn out to Oxford. In April, 1554, he acted as Notary to Cranmer and Ridley in their disputation in that city, and was in apparent safety, for so far he had not been an outspoken controversialist, when suddenly he was "pounced upon and required to consent to Romish articles or face the

stake. Bewildered and helpless, Jewel, alas! complied. Reluctantly he signed his name and was from that moment a heart-stricken man."[1] He departed from Oxford with the Romish bloodhounds again on his track, but his time was not yet come. Had Rome foreseen Jewel's great work which was yet to be, how carefully would she have numbered him with the noble Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer! As Jewel journeyed from Oxford (not 24 hours too soon), he was met by Augustine Bernher, old Bishop Latimer's faithful attendant, who took him a little later to the house of a godly widow, Mrs. Warcup, who sheltered a number of the Reformed clergy. He arrived in London some time later and whilst in hiding, acted as tutor to the sons of Mr. Darcy. This gentleman eventually got Jewel safely out of the country and the scholar arrived at Frankfort on 13th March, 1555.

In conversation with Dr. Sandys, afterwards Archbishop of York, Jewel declared his intention of preaching a sermon confessing his lamentable mistake of having signed the Romish recantation. This he appears to have done in the presence of the English refugee congregation at Frankfort. He soon received an invitation from Peter Martyr to go to Strassburg, there to join other companions in exile, including a future Archbishop of Canterbury (Grindal), a future Dean of St. Paul's (Nowell), and many others. Martyr now went as Professor of Hebrew to Zurich and requested Jewel to accompany him and lodge in his house. At Zurich he met the famous Swiss

1. Parker Society "Biography," p. 11.

theologian, Henry Bullinger (whose sermons published in Latin and English were in great demand in England), Pilkington, afterward's Bishop of Durham, and his old tutor and friend Parkhurst.

We will not fail to observe how wonderfully Jewel was being fitted for the great work that lay before him. He moved in the most learned circles of English and Continental thought and knew quite intimately the best theologians and philosophers of his day.

He returned to England after the death of Queen Mary and was forthwith named as a debater against the papal Divines at Westminster. The subjects debated were (1) Whether public worship should be in an unknown tongue? (2) Whether the Church has authority to appoint or change ceremonies and rites unto edification? (3) Whether in the Mass there is a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead?[1] Of this debate, where the Romanists were clearly beaten, Jewel says "It is altogether incredible how much this conduct has lessened the opinion that the people entertained of the Bishops: for they all begin to suspect that they refused to say anything only because they had not anything to say."[2]

We pass on then to Nov. 26th, 1559, and find him at St. Paul's Cross, a little before his consecration to the Bishopric of Salisbury, when, in a famous sermon, he issued a remarkable challenge to the effect that, if any learned man alive

1. Gee's "Elizabethan Clergy," pp. 97–98.
2. "Zurich Letters," Vol. I, p. 16.

were able to prove any of the Romish doctrines which he specified, by clear sentences either of the Scriptures, or of the old doctors, or of any general council, or by any example of the Primitive Church for the space of 600 years after CHRIST, he "would give and subscribe unto him." This challenge he repeated, after he was consecrated Bishop, at Court on March 17th, 1560, and at St. Paul's Cross on March 31st, adding a few fresh articles on this latter occasion. In the great days of old, a challenge of this character was not allowed to pass unaccepted: his first opponent was Dr. Henry Cole, who took up a warm correspondence with this new heretical Bishop. But in 1562 Jewel published his famous book "The Apology or Answer in defence of the Church of England;" the contents of which we propose to briefly outline in due course. The "Apology" was first published in Latin by request of Archbishop Parker of Canterbury. In 1564, Anne, Lady Bacon published an English translation, by which time a celebrated Romanist scholar, and curiously enough, an old school friend of Jewel's, who was now a Professor of Theology at Louvain, Dr. John Harding, gave a public reply entitled "An Answer to Mr. Jewel's challenge."

Although considerable erudition was displayed by Dr. Harding, Jewel's victory was quite complete as may be read in the "Defence of the Apology," by Bishop Jewel and "Dr. Harding's answer." It would ill become an ordinary scholar to offer praises on Jewel's work: much less does it become some others to "talk down" to Jewel. Anyone can read the "Apology" and

both sides of the discussion upon it elsewhere. Meanwhile, Bishop Jewel received all kinds of congratulations on his defence of the English Reformation and its policy and constitution. Oxford University gave him the D. D. degree as an acknowledgment and the work was translated forthwith into almost every European language.[2] Let us also note the testimony of Archbishop Williams (1637) to the reception of Jewel's work by the highest authorities in Church and State.[3]

" Three great princes successively, viz., (Queen Elizabeth, James I, and Charles I) and four Archbishops of very eminent parts (Parker, Grindal, Whitgift and Bancroft) have been so satisfied with the truth and learning of this book, that they have imposed it to be chained up and read in all parish churches throughout England and Wales."

Those who read even rapidly through Jewel's works, will not be much surprised that it is reported of him, that he studied as a rule from 4 a.m. to 10 p.m. daily.

What Melancthon was to Germany and Calvin to Switzerland, that Jewel was to England; a man with an inexhaustible fund of learning. The point we are noting just now is this, that he was wholeheartedly in favour of the Reformation, knowing it from every conceivable point of view and having one sorrow of his life, that he

1. Parker Society, Vol. III, containing 1300 pages giving the debate in " question and answer " form.
2. Dr. Wordsworth " Eccles. Biog." Vol. III, p. 360.
3. " Holy Table: Name and thing," p. 208.

did not die a martyr's death with Cranmer and Ridley. Jewel thought he should have laid down his life in 1556: we can see to-day that it was a providential guidance for us which spared him to write his famous "Apology" to which we now turn:—

The Object and Contents of Bishop Jewel's "Apology," briefly outlined.

Bishop Parkhurst of Norwich, the Apologist's former Schoolmaster, in his letter to Dr. Bullinger of Zurich tells us[1] that the charge against the Church of England was that we "had departed from the true Church and the Pope, and had refused to acknowledge the Council of Trent." Pope Pius IV, in calling this Council, which had been in session, intermittently, for twenty years, sent his Nuncio Martiningo to invite Queen Elizabeth to recognise the Council.[2] Enough has been said to show the importance of the occasion, and the wisdom of Archbishop Parker's choice in putting forth Jewel's statement as the official account of our Reformed Church's position.

* * * * *

"It has been an old complaint, as may be seen from the writings of every age, that truth wanders as a stranger in the world and readily finds slanderers among those who know her not . . The case of our LORD and His Apostles is, in this respect, like that of Prophets in the

1. "Zurich Letters," Vol. I. p. 121.
2. Wordsworth, "Eccl. Biog.," Vol. III, .p 321.

Old Testament, and martyrs of more recent times in CHRIST'S Church.

To-day, we are falsely charged that we war against God, despise good works . . and esteem neither right, nor order, nor justice . . that we labour to overthrow kingdoms and monarchies. They say they have not changed their doctrines or practices . . and that we continually change and that *our religion is new*. Our case, therefore, must be brought to the light . ."

" Many thousands of our brethren, in these last twenty years, have borne witness to the Truth, in the midst of the most painful torments that could be devised, and when princes, desirous to restrain the gospel, sought many ways, they prevailed nothing . ."

" Pope Pius IV hath now pretended to call a Council and condemned many learned and godly men without hearing them speak . . For we have had good experience hereof in his last conference at the Council of Trident (Trent), where the Ambassadors and divines of the princes of Germany and of the free cities, were quite shut out from their company: nor can we yet forget how Julius III, provided warily by his writ, that none of our sort should speak in the Council (except peradventure there were some that would recant and change their opinion). For this cause, chiefly, we thought it good to yield up an account of our faith in writing, and openly to make answer to those things wherewith we have been openly charged . . Rome has condemned us for heretics without any good consideration. Heresy is no light

charge, since it is a forsaking of salvation, a renouncing of God's grace, a departing from the body and Spirit of CHRIST."

"The people of God are otherwise instructed now than they were in time past, when all the Bishop of Rome's sayings were allowed for Gospel and all religion did depend only upon their authority. Now holy Scripture is abroad, the writings of the Apostles are in print, whereby all truth and catholic doctrine may be proved and all heresy may be confuted. The Apostles and the early Fathers (Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, etc.) appeal to holy Scripture . . if we are heretics, why not master us by the divine Scriptures . . and the testimony of the Catholic Fathers? . . It is God's cause . . why not commit it to the trial of God's Word?"

* * * * *

PART II. Our belief is:—Then follows a detailed account on the basis of the Nicene Creed . . "Catholic" is shown to mean "dispersed throughout the whole world," and CHRIST alone is the head of the Church."

"The true Successors of the Apostles will do what they did, viz., Preach the Gospel . . and the Council of Carthage decreed that "no bishop should call himself the 'highest Bishop,' to which teaching your own Pope Gregory did strongly agree."

As to Priestly forgiveness, . . "the Office of 'binding and loosing' is fulfilled when we

proclaim the Gospel in all its fulness, calling for unfeigned repentance, and offering to all the merits of CHRIST."

As touching the "Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven" we say, with Chrysostom, they be "the knowledge of the Scriptures . . the preaching to believers is a sweet savour of life unto life . . to the unbelieving, of death unto death."

* * * * *

Then follows a powerful criticism on Rome's views of Clerical celibacy; of Holy Scripture, which, as Jewel asserts, contains all things necessary to Salvation; and of the Two Sacraments, Baptism and Holy Communion. Of the latter he remarks, "The Sacrament ought to be given the people in both kinds as CHRIST and His Apostles commanded . . We affirm that bread and wine are holy and heavenly mysteries of the body and blood of CHRIST and that, by them, CHRIST Himself, being the true bread of eternal life, is so *presently*[1] given unto us, as that by faith we verily receive His body and His blood. And yet we say not this so, as though we thought that the nature of the bread and wine is clearly changed and goeth to nothing."

"In speaking thus," Jewel continues, "we mean not to abase the Lord's Supper or to teach that it is but a cold ceremony and nothing to be wrought therein (as many falsely slander us we teach). For we affirm that CHRIST doth truly

1. In true presence (of spiritual blessing).

and *presently* give His own self in His Sacraments: in Baptism, that we may put Him on: in His Supper, that we may eat Him by faith and spirit and may have everlasting life by His cross and blood. And we say not that this is done slightly and coldly, but effectually and truly. For, although we do not touch the body of CHRIST with teeth and mouth, yet we hold Him fast and eat Him by faith, by understanding and by the Spirit . . Wisely, therefore, are we exhorted "to lift up our hearts" and direct our minds to heaven, because He is there by whom we must be full fed and live." But with their Masses and carrying about and worshipping bread, . . they worship otherwise than CHRIST did ordain. . . For it is our faith that applieth the death of CHRIST to our benefit, and not the act of the massing-priest.

* * * * *

"As to Ceremonies . . we still keep and esteem not only those which we are sure were delivered us from the Apostles, but some others also which we thought might be suffered, without hurt to the Church of God, for comeliness and good order, but not contrary to Holy Scripture . . All our prayers are in a language our people can understand. . . Neither have we any other Mediator and Intercessor, by whom we may have access to God the Father, than JESUS CHRIST, in whose only name all things are obtained at his Father's hand . . therefore do we not pray to the blessed Virgin Mary."

"As to Justification . . no mortal creature can be justified by his own deserts in God's sight and therefore do we fly to the mercy of our Father, through JESUS CHRIST . . His Redemption is perfect, we cannot get a better."

"We do *not* mean that it is enough merely to be baptized only and believe, as though God required nothing else . . True faith is lively (living) and can in no wise be idle . . we are "to work out our salvation with fear and trembling" that it may be clear to all men that the Spirit of Sanctification is in our bodies and CHRIST Himself doth dwell in our hearts."

* * * * *

PART III. Jewel here opens with an attack on abuses attached to the Roman observation of the Holy Communion. Masses, Communion in one kind, and Transubstantiation, powerfully maintaining the all-sufficiency of CHRIST'S death on the Cross, for all who truly believe. . . "We have learned our doctrines from CHRIST, His Apostles and the devout Fathers, and this we sincerely, and with good faith, teach our people . . We do not breed Anabaptists and heretics . . there is no country to-day so free from pestilential infections as they be wherein the Gospel is faithfully taught. In denying Rome's various errors, we do not deny Gospel truth . . there never has been an age which did not have its share of false teachers . . that fact does not make the Gospel not the Gospel . . indeed, the false shows up the true, even as thick mist van-

ishes at the sight of the sun. . . As to differences of opinion, Rome has always had her share of divisions and has them to-day, *e.g.*, As to *how* CHRIST is present in His Supper naturally, or at which word of the priest the great change is supposed to take place. . . The Reformers agreed quite as much as Rome's theologians, despite the divergence between the Swiss and Lutheran views on the question of the real presence. . . We have been thrown into prison and to death, not because we were adulterers or thieves, but because we put our trust in the living God and confessed the faith of CHRIST. . . That you persistently call us "heretics", does not prove us so, . . test us by the word of God."

* * * * *

PART IV. "It is curious that they have so much leisure to behold what is done in Germany and England, and yet they cannot see what is done at Rome . . he who tells us we should call him the "Vicar of CHRIST," should watch morals more closely. . . Some shocking charges follow, including a Roman teaching of Micius, that a priest ought not to be put out of his cure for fornication . . "it is more holy for a priest to live in fornication, than to have a wife of his own in matrimony . . I trust the Pope hath not forgotten the thousands of common harlots in Rome and his annual pension of 30,000 ducats therefrom." The crimes of of Peter Aloysius, natural son of Pope Paul III, of Archbishop Casus, Papal legate at Venice,

and Diasius, a Spaniard are detailed, and the comment is added, "These three men went unpunished by the Papal court. We do not prefer adultery before matrimony; neither do we exercise beastly sensuality, nor suffer incest to go unpunished. For if these things had pleased us, we need not have departed from their fellowship. . . Our God be thanked, although we be not the men we ought, yet, whosoever we be, compare us with these men and even our own life and innocency will soon prove untrue their malicious surmises."

Then follows a warm challenge as to Protestant loyalty . . "We have overthrown no kingdom, we have decayed no man's power or right, we have disordered no commonwealth . . When rebellion arose in Germany,[1] Martin Luther was the first to help to quench it and recall them to peace. . . Papal arrogance towards rulers of old time was almost unbelievable. . . Who poisoned Henry the Emperor, and Victor the Pope, even in the receiving of the Sacrament? I am sure they were neither Lutherans nor Zwinglians. . . While Rome has flouted Rulers (illustrations are given), our common teaching is that "we should obey Princes as men sent from God." . . "You charge us with leaving the Church and fellowship of CHRIST . . we did not lightly leave the Church of these men. Neither had we departed

1. This was a reference to the lamentable "Peasants War," in 1525, when Luther appealed to both Peasants and Landlords not to draw the sword. Upon the former insisting on a war, Luther denounced them strongly. (See Von Ranke's account in "The Reformation, pp. 334–59).

therefrom but of necessity and against our wills. . . Yet must they not brag that they are "Catholics," for claims are easily made. Their first task in Rome is to prove that they are the true church of God, instead of merely asserting so. . . Even truth has to be guarded and the Church, like the cornfield, if it goes without attention, produces weeds and thistles. . . Did the churches of Galatia and Corinth go astray and yet is it impossible for Rome to err?

St. Augustine declares, "The Church must be shewed out of the holy and canonical Scriptures and that which cannot be shewed out of them, is not the Church . . yet Pighius (1550) dares to say "Men ought not to believe, no,not the most clear and manifest words of the scriptures, unless the same be allowed for good by the interpretation and authority of the Church."

The authority of Holy Scripture is then supported by powerful quotations from Tertullian (220 A. D.) and St. Chrysostom (400) and Jewel asks "Why whelm they that light under a bushel, which ought to stand on a candlestick?"

* * * * *

"They spitefully refer to our religion as "new" but Eusebius (330 A. D.) writeth that the Christian religion from the beginning, for very spite, was called "new and strange." As for our doctrine, which we may rightlier call CHRIST'S "catholic" doctrine, it is so far off from new, that God, Who is above all most ancient, and the Father of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, hath left the same in the Gospel and Apostles' works. No

man can think our doctrine to be new, unless the same think either the Prophets' faith or the Gospel or else CHRIST Himself to be new. . . As for their religion, if it be so old, why do they not prove it by examples from the fathers and ancient councils? . . Fire and sword they always have ready at hand, but as for the old Councils and Fathers . . all mum, not a word." Then follow plain quotations from Councils and some of the earlier Popes, condemning certain mediæval doctrines and practices on similiar lines to those previously touched on. Patronage, which Rome "pretended to reform at the Council of Trident, scant 14 years past, is not dealt with at all, nor do they follow that Council's decree that Bishops were to preach "—as did the Apostles. What then is all this pomp and crack of antiquity?"

"We have truly renounced that Church wherein we could neither have the word of God sincerely taught, nor the Sacraments rightly administered. We have forsaken the Church as it is now, not as it was in the old time, and have so gone from it, as Daniel went out of the lions' den. . . And we are come to that Church, wherein they themselves cannot deny, (if they will say truly), but all things be governed purely and reverently, and, as much as we possibly could, very near to the order used in the old time. Let them compare our churches and theirs together and they shall see that themselves have gone from the Apostles' teaching."

"We have brought again the LORD'S Supper unto CHRIST'S institution, and will have it to be a Communion in very deed. . . But these

men have changed all things, contrary to CHRIST'S Institution and *have made a private Mass of the Holy Communion*. We give the LORD'S Supper unto the people and they give them a vain pageant to gaze on. We turn the scriptures into all tongues: they scant suffer theirs to be had in any tongue. We allure the people to read and hear the word of God: they drive the people from it. We lean unto knowledge: they unto ignorance. We trust unto light: they unto darkness. We reverence, as it becometh us, the writings of the Apostles and Prophets: they burn them. Finally, we in God's cause desire to stand only God's judgement: they will stand only to their own. If they study they will perceive that we have not departed from CHRIST and His Apostles, but followed them and they would desire to join us of their own accord."

* * * * *

PART VI. Here Jewel deals with the authority of General Councils and the question of their subordination, or superiority, to Holy Scripture. Wisely does he quote his favourite author, Gregory of Nazianzum, who was so disgusted with the Council of Constantinople (381 A. D.) that he 'pronounced openly that he never saw any good end of any council.' "What would he say now, if he were alive at this day, and understood the heaving and shoving of these men? . . And yet they boast that their Church cannot err."

"As to criticism of admitted abuses in the Roman system, there has been *talk* on the part of Pope Adrian, Cardinal Pole, and others . . but, when they had it all to themselves at the Council of Trent, what superstition did they take away and what tyranny have they diminished?"

"The pomp and display of Roman Bishops also is not Christian; they are like worldly princes and their pomp is very unlike the appearance of the ancient bishops Chrysostom, Augustine and Ambrose. Some of their bishops do not live even as becometh the most ordinary Christian man. Such men have no right to be present at Councils. Then again, as the prophet Isaiah says, "A King ought to be a patron and nurse of the Church" and this was not denied in scriptural days nor in the best days since. Emperors have called some of the greatest Councils, *e. g.*, Constantine called the Council at Nice, Theodosius I called the Council of Constantinople. Continually, for the space of 500 years, the Emperor alone appointed the Ecclesiastical assemblies and called the councils of the Bishops together and yet, the Bishop of Rome, knowing all this, assigns that office to himself alone."

Here follows a lengthy statement about the great care and diligence, on the part of the Church of England, to omit nothing of importance and to admit nothing which was contrary to the mind of CHRIST, His Apostles and the early Church Fathers. . .

"And what manner of Council was the same last at Trent, or how might it be termed a

" General Council " when out of all the Christian kingdoms there came to it but only forty bishops, and of those some so cunning that they might be thought meet to be sent home again to learn their grammar, and so well learned that they had never studied divinity ? "

" And as for us, we have fallen from the bishop of Rome upon no manner of worldly respect. Would to CHRIST he so behaved himself as this falling away were not needed : but so the case stood that, *unless we left him, we could not come to* CHRIST. Neither will he now make any other league with us than such a one as Nahash, King of the Ammonites, who wish to put out the right eye of all the inhabitants of the city of Jabes. Even so will the Pope pluck us from the holy Scripture, the gospel of our salvation,and all the confidence which we have in CHRIST JESUS and upon other condition can he not agree upon peace with us. . ."

" As to the Popes being sucessors of St. Peter, they seem to be unlike the Apostle at every point . . and these things being so, why glory in Peter's name and succession ? "

Rome's arrogance towards various kings of England is next considered, particularly the cases of Henry II, John and Henry VIII—and the Pope's invitation to the King of France to conquer England.

The author then gives a useful recapitulation of the " Apology " in which the chief points are as follows :—

(*a*) The religion which has been restored, is that of our Saviour JESUS CHRIST, and of the Primitive Church.

(*b*) We neither teach nor encourage heresy nor rebellion and never have done so. We have stated clearly our belief concerning God the Father, His Son JESUS CHRIST and the Holy Spirit; also of the Church, the Sacraments, the Holy Scriptures, the Ministry and every part of Christian belief.

(*c*) In our Reformation, we have not waited for the Council of Trent, which did nothing uprightly. It condemned the princes' ambassadors and refused our divines a hearing.

(*d*) We have restored our churches by a provincial convocation and shaken off the Bishop of Rome.

(*e*) We sought, in our actions, neither glory nor pleasure, nor wealth, nor ease: these we could have had, if we had remained with our opponents.

(*f*) If the Pope will have us reconciled to him, his first duty is to be reconciled to God . . we are sure all is true that we teach, and we may not go against conscience or bear witness against God.

As might be expected, Jewel's sermon, eventually published in booklet form as the 'Apology,' attracted the greatest attention. The most learned reply thereto was given by the Jesuit—Dr. Harding. Each leading statement was discussed, attacked by Harding and most brilliantly defended by Jewel.

Our *précis* has, we trust, given a fair idea of the "Apology's" salient points. When we hear the Reformation assailed, we do well to recollect what Bishop Jewel had to say about it. We shall

not fail to keep clearly before our minds that ; (*a*) Jewel was acknowledged to be the greatest scholar in the Church of his day. (*b*) He was a tireless, accurate student whose knowledge of Church history, and the writings of the early church Fathers, was only equalled by his extraordinary grasp of the text and meaning of Holy Scriptures. (*c*) He knew, most intimately, the leading English and Continental Reformers and moved freely amongst them, being accepted *persona grata* by all. His right to speak with authority cannot thus be reasonably questioned. (*d*) the "Apology" received the public approval of both Church and State. It is impossible, for these reasons, to discount the value of Bishop Jewel's work. A careful study of the full text would prove helpful to all who are really interested in the subject.

* * * * *

Space forbids our lengthening out the story of good Bishop Jewel's activities. In 1563 the second book of Homilies was published, chiefly from his pen. Not until 1568 was his great work, "A Defence of the Apology," made accessible to the public. It is a monument to Jewel's extraordinary knowledge and a perfect armoury against the pretensions of Rome. His remaining years were as busy as the previous ones had been, despite his failing health and extreme weakness. On September 22nd, 1571, he passed to his heavenly rest.

There is no argument about the excellence of Jewel's life and character. He not only dis-

puted about religion : he practiced it daily and hourly. One of Jewel's kindest and wisest acts was that of assisting, in a very liberal manner, a youth whom Churchmen to-day refer to as "the Judicious Hooker," the famous author of "Ecclesiastical Polity." In a lengthy and sympathetic biography, by Isaac Walton, we may read the story of Jewel's beneficence and it is interesting to read there, Hooker's encomium of the Bishop, as not only his "kind patron," but "the worthiest divine that Christendom hath bred for the space of some hundreds of years."[1] Jewel's biographer, Humfrey, says "and so he went on, restlessly trashing it out. With reading, writing, preaching and travelling he hastened his death before he was full fifty years." By his energy, and readiness to give to the Church of England and the great Reformation movement, of his best, he has laid all loyal churchmen under an unspeakable debt of gratitude.

* * * * *

Taking now a brief survey of the Reformation in the earlier part of Elizabeth's reign, we observe that in January, 1559 that illustrious Queen was crowned by Bishop Oglethorpe of Carlisle. Very discreetly did Elizabeth move in the matter of reform : she was wise enough to listen to the excellent advisers she had gathered around her, particularly Sir William Cecil and Sir Nicholas

1. "Life of Richard Hooker," by Isaac Walton. Preface to Ecclesiastical Polity, Vol. I, pp. 17–19.; also pp. 264–65. Wordsworth's "Ecclesiastical Biography," Vol. III, p. 368.

Bacon. She notified the Pope (Paul IV) of her accession, and that Prelate sent back an undignified letter, informing her that she was illegitimate and that England was a fief of the Holy See. However, if she humbled herself and submitted to the will of the Pope, he would see what he could do. Elizabeth at once withdrew the English ambassador, Sir Philip Carne.[1]

One of her Acts was that known as the "Supremacy Act, Restoring Ancient Jurisdiction," passed in 1559, which restored the great Reformation Acts which Mary had abolished. Papal Supremacy was again abolished as in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI. Another remarkable feature of this Act was that it appointed Commissioners to adjudge cases of "heresy," the standard of judgment being "the Canonical Scriptures or the first four General Councils, or by Parliament, with the assent of the Clergy in Convocation." The *status quo* of 1553, the last year of the reign of Edward VI, was restored. At the same time (1559) was passed the Act of Uniformity, which restored the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI, with three slight alterations, already signified (see Ch. v.). The Bishops of the period stoutly opposed both these Acts, and we are not much indebted to them for the Reformation: they did their utmost to stop it, and failed. If they were not tired of Rome, the Queen and the vast body of Churchmen were. After Parliament rose, the "Injunctions" of Edward were revised and

1. Archdeacon Taylor "Lecture on Queen Elizabeth," p. 47. Gee and Hardy "Documents," pp. 442, 455 and 458, *et seq.*

amplified, setting forth in detail many principles of the settlement. These were to be read aloud quarterly, and during the long reign of Queen Elizabeth, forty-five years, they had a considerable influence in moulding English Churchmanship.[1] It was on the question of the Royal Supremacy, *i. e.*, as opposed to the Papal Supremacy, that the Queen experienced the most trouble and she took a short path in dealing with her difficulties. She swept the whole company of the Bishops off the bench, except one genuine old "Vicar of Bray," Dr. Kitchen of Llandaff, who stuck to his position and income through every storm, and could always be too ill to come if a difficulty arose. His record reads, "He greatly impoverished the See."[2] In a little while, the vacant Sees were filled up by men who preferred the Bible to the Latin Missal and a measure of real freedom to the gibbet and stake.

The first point, in 1563, was the careful revision of the 42 Articles, on which Cranmer and others had worked so strenuously during Edward VI's declining days. These were revised and eventually published as the Thirty-Nine Articles, being ratified in 1571.

The Second Book of Homilies and Jewel's 'Apology,' were approved by the same Convocation and the Reformation was virually completed.

Thus the Church possessed an English Prayer Book, XXXIX Articles for the Clergy, Two books

1. Dean Gee's "Elizabethan Prayer Book," p. 138 foot note; also Lectures on "English Church History."
2. Llandaff "Diocesan Calendar," "List of Bishops."

of Homilies for edification of the congregation, and an excellent Catechism for schools and Universities. (This catechism was subsequently enlarged—see Dr. Drury's Handbook).[1]
Added to the above, in due course came Foxe's "Acts and Monuments" telling the story of the martyrs in the Marian persecution.

In 1569, Pius V. issued a Bull against Elizabeth, deposing her from her throne and inciting her subjects to rebel against her. A Romish zealot, named John Felton, nailed the Bull to the door of the Bishop of London's palace, and met his death in the act.

It is sometimes erroneously asserted that the martyrdoms under Elizabeth were as numerous and cruel as they were under Mary. Motley's reply on this subject appears to be thoroughly adequate; :—"Elizabeth was no advocate for religious liberty nor had she the faintest idea of it, It would, however, be unjust in the extreme to overlook the enormous difference in the amount of persecution exercised by the Protestant and Roman Churches. It is probable that not more than 200 Catholics were executed as such in Elizabeth's reign, and this was ten score too many.

But what was this against 800 heretics burned, hanged and drowned in the Easter week by the Duke of Alva; against the 18,200 sent to the stake and scaffold as he boasted, during his administration; against the hundreds of thousands who perished by the edicts of Charles V. in the

1. "How we got our Prayer Book," p. 130, where we read "An explanation of the Sacraments was added in 1604."

Netherlands, or in the single St. Bartholomew's massacre in France? Moreover, it should never be forgotten, that most of the Catholics who were executed in England suffered rather as conspirators than heretics. She had been denounced by the Pope as a bastard and usurper, her subjects had been released from the bonds of allegiance, and a crown of glory promised to those who should succeed in depriving her of life: such was the position of Elizabeth. It was war to the knife between her and Rome, declared by Rome herself, and the seminary priests who came to England were a perpetually organized band of conspirators and assassins."[1]

Such a view is corroborated by two extraordinary Acts of Parliament one in 1585, "Against Jesuits" and another in 1593, "Against Recusants."[2] In justification of Elizabeth, we may point out that, before these Acts were passed, there had been the Great Northern rebellion of 1569 to "restore the old order," the Papal bull excommunicating the Queen and causing Roman Catholics to leave the Church of England in 1570. Then followed various plots and the missions of Jesuits from the Continent. Dr. Gee says "A good many suffered under these Acts, but they suffered as traitors to the realm, not merely for their religious views. It was acknowledged that all things considered the Government of Elizabeth had been even lenient to the Romanists . . about 110 of whom were put to death between 1588 and 1603 . . the harder times began after the first ten years of Elizabeth's reign.

1. "Dutch Republic," Vol. II, pp. 276–77.
2. "Documents," p. 485 and 498.

. . It was in 1594 that Lopez the Queen's physician tried to poison her . .[1]

Archdeacon Taylor remarks about Elizabeth, "Whatever may have been the faults of her personal character, she did a work for England which we can never fully appreciate. She rescued the nation from the grasp of the Papacy and restored and consolidated the Reformation."[2]

The Reformation for all practical purposes concluded within five years of her accession, and the full story of Rome's attempt to take by force what she had quite failed to retain by upright conduct, and of her sending the Spanish Armada, etc., must be read elsewhere.[3]

Sufficient has been said in this chapter to show the outlines of the Elizabethan settlement, and the view taken of it at the time by the Church's most accomplished scholar, good Bishop Jewel of Salisbury.

1. "Reformation Period," p. 254.
2. "Lecture on Queen Elizabeth," p. 60.
3. Mr. Albert Close "Defeat of the Spanish Armada," pp. 36–76.

VII.

Inheritors and Guardians are We.

If our previous chapters have demonstrated one truth more than another, assuredly it must be the fact that the Reformation was not one sudden great event which took all Europe by surprise, but the crisis to which, in various ways, matters had been tending for long years. If the fire did at last run all over England and Northern Europe with wonderful rapidity, it was because the trees were all dry. To give Henry VIII all the blame, or all the praise, for the Reformation, is to fail to appreciate the international character of the movement, as well as to shut our eyes to the flagrancy, and far reaching consequences of the evils spreading, through the visible Church of CHRIST, to the various states and kingdoms of Western Christendom.

We have clearly observed that Martin Luther and our own William Tyndale, outstanding men of the movement's earliest public days, though the true successors of men who had worked in more private ways for Reformation success, had only one connection with Henry, viz., that they faced the worst opposition that monarch could offer them. Had there been no Henry

VIII, no Martin Luther and no William Tyndale, God would have used other human beings for the furtherance of this purification of His Church. As in the formation of the primitive Church, so in the re-formation of the mediæval Church, one man planted, another watered, but it was God Who graciously gave the increase.

The faults and failings of both Reformers and Reformation have been very skilfully displayed by opponents. These we do not propose to advertise afresh: our claim for the good men whose lives we have briefly outlined is simply this, that, possessed with more than ordinary ability and such courage as followed the truth whithersoever it led, with nothing in the world to gain, though nearly everything to lose as they dared to stand for principle, these men, under God, gave the Christian Church a new lease of life. There were doubtless defects in their work, and there were minor losses with some of their changes, but the gains were immeasurably greater than both. We to-day admire their work and accept most, if not all, of their doctrines.

Nevertheless, we only profess to follow the Reformers as far as they followed CHRIST, and so faithful were they in their teachings, that as we follow them, we find ourselves wondrously near to Him.

Professor Cunningham, a learned writer on Reformation theology, makes a remark about Luther which might be made, *mutatis mutandis*, concerning nearly all our Reformers, starting life, as they did, in the Roman school of theological thought:—

"Protestants do not regard Luther as a pope:

they ascribe to him no infallibility, they receive no doctrine *because* he taught it; and as to Luther himself, he always fully confessed, that when he first raised his voice against indulgences, he was little better than a blind papist; that he was involved in great ignorance and error; that he had yet a great deal to learn and that he learned slowly and gradually. He retracted his errors fully and frankly whenever he was convinced of them and during the whole progress of his views, gave the most satisfactory evidence of thorough integrity and love of the truth."[1]

Bishop Jewel's plain assertions about the desire where possible, to retain everything that was ancient *and* helpful, while discarding superstitions which retarded Christian truth and progress, need not be emphasised again. When they sought to worship God in a simple and more scriptural way, and in accord with inward spiritual experience, they never for one moment, accepted the idea that they were deserting the Church of CHRIST. This point is made clear beyond a peradventure, not only in Cranmer's "Prefaces" to the Prayer Book and in Jewel's "Apology," but also in Calvin's "Institutes" and Luther's "Concerning Christian Liberty." They plainly proved they were Reformers, and not in any manner or degree to be mistaken for Anarchists or Bolshevists—as some of their present-day traducers wish to assert.

* * * * *

We are inheritors of blessings for which they

1. "Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation" Lecture II, p. 108.

worked, lived, suffered and died, and miserable persons shall we be if we fail to act as guardians of so sacred a trust. We do not expect those who dislike the Reformation to defend it; but we who love it have a bounden duty which includes the tasks of fully learning its leading principles and, by the Divine aid, carrying them out in our daily lives. Inheritors and Guardians are we: let us examine our treasure and enumerate some of its present-day blessings. To simplify matters let us concentrate our thoughts on the English Reformation always clearly remembering that in fundamentals it was one with the Continental movement; though we shall be pardoned it we think that, in the cleansing of our Church, our forefathers exhibited a more conservative and evenly-balanced judgment than some of their most illustrious brethren abroad.

I. An Open English Bible. This is a well-worn phrase: what precisely is it to stand for? The privilege, the inestimable boon of the right to study the Bible in our mother-tongue. We have to thank Tyndale in England—just as Germany and France were indebted to Luther and Lefèvre—for a vernacular translation. The new view of the Bible was really an ancient, apostolic view, for the men of the 'new learning' presented the Holy Scriptures as St. Paul did to the Thessalonians (see I Epis., Ch. ii. 1 3)" ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth. the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe." In the Bible God spoke to His children, the Saviour to the sinner, and the inspired Apostles to the Church of God as

long as time should last. It was the Divine hand-book of spiritual comfort and guidance for all who sought the way to the Kingdom of Heaven: always a help and never a hindrance.

The Bible was not only given its rightful place in the private life, but also in the public Services. The whole idea might be summed up thus "reading in the Church of God unto edification": hence in all the Reformed churches, the clergy are to face the people and read plainly, that they may be understood and the people be instructed.

The principle of an 'open bible' was most comprehensive in its sweep, for a Public Service is a logical consequence of the scriptures in the vernacular. No student of the Bible, with St. Paul's words in I. *Corinthians* Ch. xiv. 1–22 as his guide, would be prepared to accept a religious service he could not understand. Hence we may point with pride to our English Book of Common Prayer which was a direct outcome of the Reformation and chiefly the work of Archbishop Cranmer. It was a fitting companion of the Bible, from which it took its doctrines.

Had the Reformation been permitted to fail, we should to-day have services almost entirely in Latin, and the Bible, for ninety-five per cent of our people, would have been an inaccessible book. We will not enumerate the untold losses which would have ensued, but rejoice that, for private and public devotion, the simple lines are still gloriously true:—

"Holy Bible, Book Divine,
Precious treasure, Thou art mine."

* * * * *

(I *a*) Closely allied to public reading, was the Preaching of the Word. This was a benefit from many points of view, for whenever preaching is given its proper place, we find enlightenment according to the measure of faithfulness to the scriptural message given by the preacher. Where Rome holds sway, there is very little preaching and where she is most respectable, *e. g.*, in England and Scotland, the people are clearly given to understand that such work is not regarded as of primary importance. The Reformed view of all teaching and preaching has ever been, that it is to be respected and embraced wherever and whenever it is "in accordance with God's Word written." Calvin and Jewel complained that mediæval Popes never preached, though the Apostles regarded the work as of first-rate importance as did all the early Church Fathers.[1]

(I. b) The all-sufficiency of Holy Scripture as the Divine rule of faith, was also clearly asserted. This, again, was a distinct return to primitive Church teaching and practice. As the Bible was set in a place of honour at the Council of Nicaea (325), so was it reverenced now as the final court of appeal for the layman, the popular preacher, and the Professor of divinity alike: "To the law and to the testimony."

Easiest for reference will be the XXXIX Articles and these agree, for all practical pur-

1. Compare Dr. Salmon's "Infallibility of the Church," especially lectures VII and IX on "The Church's Office of Teaching," etc.,; also Dean Goode "The Divine Rule of Faith," Chapter IX.

poses, with the best Continental teaching. We may observe Article VI, "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to Salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to Salvation." The Creeds also are to be received and believed, because they may be proved by the clear teaching of Holy Scripture: see Article VIII. Differing from this position, and much more complicated, was the Church of Rome's position as laid down at the Council of Trent[1] which published the Creed of Pope Pius IV in 1564 as a reply to the Reformation theology, and declared—note the order—1st, "I most stedfastly admit and *embrace* the apostolic and ecclesiastical *traditions* and all other observances and constitutions of the same church." 2nd, "Also I *admit*—note the phrase—the Holy Scripture, according to that sense which Holy Mother Church has held and holds, to which Church it belongs to judge the true sense and interpretation of Holy Scriptures: nor will I ever receive or interpret it except according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."

Our readers will see that there is a vast difference between the Reformed and the Roman positions. One might expect, from the second article of the Creed of Pope Pius, that the Church of Rome would publish the finest Commentaries on the Bible, but alas! it is otherwise.

1. Canon Girdlestone "English Church Teaching," p.p. 52–53.

Rome has produced very few Commentators on Holy Writ. While we rejoice to think of the truly great men the Reformed Churches have reared, such as Matthew Henry, Lightfoot, Westcott, Godet, MacLaren, and many others, we also ask for Rome's list of great names in this department of sacred study. For our hundreds she could not produce tens. She "stedfastly embraces" tradition, and coldly "admits" Holy Scripture with an absurd saving clause which for practical people makes the Bible a sealed book..

The devout Romanist has to listen to the "voice of the Church" instead of hearkening to God's living oracles. Our inheritance in this respect is great and glorious. Are we guardians and partakers of the rights as we should be ?

II. An Approachable Saviour. Probably in no point was the Mediæval church further from scrpitural truth than in the all-important question of the salvation of the souls of mankind. Salvation from sin had become quite a mechanical process. Repentance and faith, where not completely abolished, occupied nothing like the important position the New Testament accords to them. St. Peter and St. Paul could not have recognised such teaching and given it the name of Christianity or of the Gospel. Indulgences, which in the earliest stages had to do with ecclesiastical discipline,[1] had now become the recognised and purchasable method of abolishing sins committed and indeed about to be committed. To Luther must be given the credit

1. Lindsay "Reformation," pp. 216–28.

of re-establishing the doctrine of Justification by faith, though if we wish to be more correct we should say "Justification for CHRIST's sake through faith."[2]

The XIth Article on this subject is worthy of study. The old idea about God's readiness to receive all who come to Him by CHRIST was magnificently reinstated by the Reformation doctrine of Assurance taught by no one more accurately than by Calvin (see Chap. iii. p. 112) gave to sincere believers in CHRIST, a strength of conviction based, not on personal vanity and assumption but, on CHRIST's complete sacrifice for us and the unfailing promises of our heavenly Father. Hence the basis of Salvation was not so-called "good works," but faith in CHRIST and the works which followed proved the faith was real, just as we judge a tree by its fruits. The Romish doctrine of Purgatory could not, of course, co-exist with such teaching concerning the Saviour's perfect work: all purgation from sin is to be here and now, for "the blood of JESUS CHRIST, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin (*I John* i. 7 and *St. John* xix. 30). The "sacrifice of the Mass" in which, according to Rome, the offering of CHRIST is "daily renewed" by the Priest at the Altar, vanishes in view of such teaching concerning CHRIST's perfect life and death for His believing people. The Reformation gave a powerful appeal which could be stated in the simple, pregnant phrase "back to CHRIST": whereas the Roman position at its

2. Dean Wace "Principles of the Reformation," pp. 55–56; and see previous note from Dr. Philip Schaff, p. 18.

best (after 40 years of Protestant criticism) as stated at the Council of Trent, was Salvation by faith in CHRIST, plus meritorious works, such as penances and indulgences, with the prospect of a painful period in Purgatory to fit us for the Saviour's presence. How different the scriptural view of the Christ, Who loved us sufficiently to die for us: even the death of the Cross, "where He made (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."[1]

* * * * *

III. A MINISTRY RATHER THAN A PRIESTHOOD. Everything in the Mediæval church was sacramental and the position of the Priest had become dominant and, as we have demonstrated, almost hid the view of the Saviour. Forgiveness was *via* the Sacrament of Penance with auricular confession (spoken into the ear of the priest) and sacerdotal absolution, in order to reconcile sinners to God. "The Reformation proclaims the non-necessity of any confessional whatever, save that which the penitent sinner can at all times enter by personal application to CHRIST and receive at once from His own gracious lips the blessing of a frank, free and full absolution, with grace and help to sin no more."[2]

Hence the Clergy of the Church call on the people in divine service, to Confess to God direct and then they have the honour of declaring His conditions of forgiveness Whose accredited

1. Consecration Prayer in Holy Communion Service.
2. Archdeacon Taylor "Reformation Lectures," p. 66

ambassadors they are. "He pardoneth and absolveth all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe His Holy Gospel." Closely allied to such teaching, as suggested under section II, we have, as a consequence, Paradise for the blessed departed instead of Purgatory.

A most important return to primitive Christian teaching was the doctrine of the Holy Communion instead of the Mass, and a more correct notion of the Real Presence of CHRIST. Rome taught[1] "I profess likewise that in the Sacrament of the Eucharist . . . there takes place a change of the whole substance of the bread into the Body and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood, which change, the Catholic Church calls *Transubstantiation*. Very differently, and much more scripturally, does the martyred Archbishop Cranmer teach us that "the Body of CHRIST is in heaven and not here." The bread and wine on the LORD'S Table are emblems of His Blessed body and blood, pledges of His love and precious means of Grace to "all who rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same." The "real presence" is not in the elements, but in the hearts of CHRIST'S faithful people as they draw nigh to obey His dying command "Do this in remembrance of Me." There can be no doubt that the Schoolmen taught that the Sacraments operated mechanically, like charms (*ex opere operato*), quite independently of the worshipper's faith and of his reception of the Elements.[2] The

1. Creed of Pope Pius IV (1564).

2. For a most helpful treatment of this great subject see Bishop Moule "English Church Teaching," pp. 112–44,

Reformation saved us from such degraded notions of the Sacraments and we may thank the Reformers for the concise and biblical statements of our liturgy and formularies. We will not forget that a number of our Reformers suffered death by burning as "heretics" for daring to deny Rome's unscriptural dogmas in the above matter. They did not change their view without considerable study, nor did they arrive suddenly at the views they finally held: the study of Holy Scripture and of the earlier writers of the Church of CHRIST led them to a purer doctrine and practice. This treasure we are to guard, drawing nigh with a pure heart and with full assurance of faith in CHRIST'S all-sufficient sacrifice for us.

Closely related to this subject of the "Ministry" is that of the "Priesthood of *all* believers." This lofty Reformation principle Luther applied to doctrine, Calvin going further applied it also to Church Government and we in England have endeavoured to some extent to embrace both ideas, possibly following Luther more than Calvin. It will not be necessary to reiterate statements which came under the heading of Luther's teachings (p. 62–4), but we may point out that there are two sacrifices which all "believer-priests" are to offer unto God.

(1). Present your bodies a living sacrifice,

and note carefully Articles XXVIII, XXIX and XXXI in the Prayer Book.

For a fuller treatment see Dr. Griffith Thomas "A Sacrament of our Redemption," and a comprehensive article "The Doctrine of the Sacraments," by the late, erudite Dr. Cunningham in "Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation," pp. 212–92.

holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service (*Rom.* xii. 1). This will lead to communicating and doing good, with which sacrifices, God is well pleased (*Heb.* xiii. 15–16).

(2). Ye are a holy priesthood (of believers) to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through JESUS CHRIST (*I Peter* ii. 5).[1]

It is to be feared that many who are strong against "Priestly arrogance" do not always see that the Priesthood of all believers is a call to every living Christian to do his or her part in CHRIST'S warfare. "But if we are all Priests" some one may say, "why then can we not all perform any of the Offices of the Church?" For an excellent reply see Article XXIII and also think what sort of a church we should have without a set and dignified order! The priesthood of all believers is indeed a lofty principle: it effected the enfranchisement of the laity and gave them a clarion call to CHRIST'S service. Let us cease to talk about principles if we are failing at this point. How blameworthy are we if, when Christian liberty has been so dearly purchased, we merely talk about it, or admire it, and yet fail to use it! Inheritors and guardians are we: may we be so to the greater glory of God!

(IV). THE TRUE IDEA OF THE CHURCH. The Reformation corrected certain radically wrong ideas on this subject, and so we to-day distinguish between the Church mystical and the mere outward body: the former is the blessed com-

1. See also "English Church Teaching," by Bishop of Ripon, pp. 240–44.

pany of all faithful people; they are united to CHRIST by the indwelling Spirit They are regenerated, renewed and sanctified: conformed to the image of CHRIST, they walk religiously in good works and finally by God's mercy they attain to everlasting life (Article XVII). This spiritual body of CHRIST consisting of all true Christians, in all Christian communities, is not to be confounded with an aggregate of visible churches, still less with any one of them.[1] All visible churches are mixed bodies, consisting of good and bad. To the former alone belong the promises, as they alone are partakers of the life of CHRIST. But here the Roman church steps in and claims to be not merely an important part of the Universal Church but the whole of it.[2] We do not object to Rome regarding herself as a part of the visible church (we think a corrupt part) but when the Pope declares himself the "true successor of St. Peter" and the Vicar of CHRIST on earth, and claims an infallibility for that church, we are bound to reject his claims. Meanwhile, "the visible Church of CHRIST is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to CHRIST'S ordinance"—See Article XIX which, of course, gives us our Church's official declaration.

The Reformation taught that true believers in CHRIST JESUS are *unitedly* the Holy Catholic Church and, following on the lines of Scripture,[3]

1. Taylor "Reformation Lectures," pp. 70–71.
2. Creed of Pope Pius IV; also K. von Hase "Handbook," Vol. I, pp. 10–16.
3. See our Lord's "Parable of the Tares among the wheat," St. Matt. xiii, 24–30.

pointed out that the good be ever mingled with the bad and that so it will continue to be until time shall cease.

(V). CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY were among the pearls of the Reformation stores: spiritual, political and intellectual freedom in the widest, noblest sense. The rights of individual conscience, the frank recognition of the far-reaching principle that each man has the right to think for himself and to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, though not failing to accord that privilege in the fullest measure to others. This is not admitted by the Church of Rome, as may be clearly seen in the ghastly story of the Inquisition, which crushed all liberty in the individual, while the Papacy itself stamped out the ancient National Churches, *e. g.*, of Spain and France, interfering less successfully elsewhere, notably England, Scotland and the Netherlands. In Germany and Switzerland, of course, the Papacy never had a semblance of victory despite the means used to achieve it.

This glorious freedom was not fully realised or exercised immediately. Tremendous battles were fought in nearly every country in Europe. We have previously recounted the privations and sufferings endured by our Reformers that we might have the freedom we now enjoy. Others doubtless thought with them, but not all had the superhuman courage with which these great men were, severally, so largely endowed. And so the nations that embraced the Reformation prospered and were free. Let Rome and the Agnostic deny it, and postulate "geographical

conditions" or the like. We point to Scotland and Holland and compare them with Italy and Spain.[1] Sacerdotalism and priestly pretension enslave the mind, but the Reformation, restoring both the Bible and biblical principles, was the great generator of liberty, private and personal, religious and secular, civic and national. We are elsewhere reminded that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and the fact cannot be too frequently brought before our minds. Many persons prefer to adopt an attitude of superiority when it is remarked that, what has already been won after hard fighting must needs be guarded carefully, lest by vigorous and ceaseless counter-attacks we lose the fruits of victory. We, for our part, believe that the Reformation was an unspeakable blessing and we trust the day will never dawn when British people will be prepared to think lightly of it.

* * * * *

Thus have we sketched with brevity the story of the leading Reformers and the outstanding points of the Reformation in England and on the Continent. Other matters might have been included and some others dealt with more fully than has been the case, but that would have made a very large volume instead of a comparatively small one. We have given, we believe, a fair general account of the Reformation, and if what has been written quickens any

1. Macaulay's "History," Vol. I, Ch. I, may be read in this connection.

slothful believers into activity, or helps any persons to a view of the importance of the subject not hitherto obtained, we shall indeed feel that our reward has been great. If we once enthusiastically accept Reformation principles and practice them, we shall be diligent servants and soldiers of CHRIST, as well as useful, faithful, active members of the Church which is His body: of such men and women England to-day has great need. May it be given to every reader of these lines to follow the Reformers even as they followed JESUS CHRIST—their LORD and ours.

INDEX.

Albert of Brandenburg, 8, 9
Anabaptists, 73–4, 84, 211
Apostolic Succession, 20, 62, 80, 105, 113–4, 204, 232
Articles of Belief, 38, 44, 158–9, 160–1, 175, 197, 223, 232
" Assurance," 102, 111–2, 235
Appeals to Rome, 10, 145, 154

Bible: The Closed, 14, 20, 130–1, 223; ——, The Open, 15, 26, 63, 107, 159, 164, 216; —— translated, 32, 41, 43, 89, 118, 124, 216; —— reading, 123–4, 232; —— standard of faith and practice, 63, 94, 107, 113, 232
Brethren of the Common Life, 23
" Bishops' Book," 159–60
" Book of Bertram," 181–2

Calvin: 9, 10, 66 ff; Life of ——, Chap. III.; Commentaries of ——, 70, 76, 83; Calvin's constructive work, 75, 78–81; banishment of Calvin, 74–6; Calvin's discipline, 72, 74, 78–82; manners of Calvin, 65, 87–9; Estimates of ——, 91–3; —— on H. Communion, 78–81; Calvin's " Institutes," 69–75, 97 ff; —— " Ordinances," 78–82; Calvin on Presbyterianism, 79–80, 102–5, 195; —— and Servetus, 83–6
Catechisms and Teaching, 19, 58–60, 63, 191,
Celibacy Clerical, 46–8, 212
" Centum Gravamina," 11, 33
Charles V., Emperor, 32, 37, 39
Christian Liberty 56–8, 143–4, 241
Communion, Holy, 16, 37, 39, 61, 106–9, 209–10, 215
Confirmation, 106, 193–4
Consubstantiation, 37, 60, 64

Council of Constance, 4, 11, 48 ; —— Trent, 8, 11, 48–9, 207, 215, 236 ; —— Nicæa, 47, 84, 217, 230
Counter-Reformation, 181–2, 193, 204
" Cujus regio, ejus Religio " ; 34, 39–40
Cranmer : Life of, Chap. V. ; —— at Cambridge, 150–1 ; —— and Henry's " Divorce," 151–3 ; Cranmer's 1st Prayer Book, 170–3 ; —— 2nd Prayer Book, 173–5, 189–92, 222 ; Cranmer and " Book of Bertram," 181–2 ; —— the Martyr, 185–7 ; ——and Episcopacy, 194–6 ·

Diet of Augsburg, 30, 37–40 ; —— Nurnberg, 11 33 ; —— Speyer, 34–6, 39 ; —— Worms, 31–2

Early Fathers, 27, 77, 82, 94, 204, 238
Eck, Dr. J., 31, 57
Edward VI., King, 167–75 ; —— favours Reformation, 168–9 ; —— early death, 175–6
Education, 19–20, 43–4, 59, 90, 112
Elizabeth, Queen, 221, ft ; —— restores Reformation, 222 ; —— " persecutions " of, 224–5 ; —— and the 2nd Prayer Book, 222 ;
" English Church Teaching," 49, 105, 233, 237, 239
Episcopacy, 86, 95, 103–4, 113–4, 194–6
" Epiklesis," 170–1, 193
Erasmus, 12, 99, 120 ; —— on Monasteries, 12, 48
" Ex opere operato," 108, 237

" Fidei Defensor," 56
Farel, William, 70–1

Gardiner, Bishop, 151, 172, 176
" Good Works," Doctrine of, 18–9, 58, 62, 134–5, 211, 235
Greek Study revived, 21, 120
Grosseteste, Bishop, 10 ; 144

Henry VIII, see Chap. V. ; —— and the Reformation, 128, 142–3, 146, 166, 194, 227 ; —— " Divorce," 146–9, 151 ; ——not a Protestant, 166, 227 ; ——, 5th Parliament of, 154–7 ; —— Six Articles, 161–3 ; —— King's Book, 164 ; —— last Will of, 165

Heresy charged on Reformers, 116, 185, 206 ; —— punishable, 85, 116 ; —— defined, 222 ;
Huss, John, 6, 30–1.
Hymns and Psalms, 42-3, 81

Indulgences, 7–9, 27–30 ; 62 ; 236
Injunctions, 222-3
Inquisition, The, 85, 114–7, 177, 215 ; 241

Justification referred to, 18–9, 58, 62, 77, 101, 133–4, 211 235 ; ——explained, 18–9, 211
Jewel, Bishop John, Chap. VI. ; —— and Queen Mary, 201 ; —— and P. Martyr, 200, 202 ; ——, Notary to Cranmer, 201 ; Jewel's fine character, 199, 220 ; Jewel on Continent, 202, ff ; Jewel's "Challenge," 204 ; —— "Apology," outlined, 206 ff ; Jewel, Great authority of, 202, 205

Latimer, Bishop, 163, 179–80, 183
Lefevre, 70
Loyola Ignatius, 66, 114–7
Luther, Martin, Life of, Chap. II. ; Luther's constructive work, 41–4, 62–3 ; —— phraseology 45–6 ; —— marriage 46–8 ; —— writings outlined, 50 ff

Marot, Clement, 81
Marburg Conference, 37
Mary, Queen, 176 ff ; ——abolishes Reformation, 177–8 ; —— recalls Papal legate, 178 ; ——, great persecution by, 177–82
Mass, Sacrifice of, 16, 81, 181 ; ——repudiated, 16–17, 81, 203, 216, 237
Melancthon, Philip, 34, 40–1, 75, 88
Monasteries and Monks, 12-13, 48, 156–8, 162

Necessity of Reformation, Chap. I.

Peasants' War, 213
Papacy, 3, 13, 26, 53-4, 104, 194, 207
Patronage abuses, 9–11, 66, 215
Persecution by Papacy, 7, 114–7, 207
Pope John XXIII., 3–5 ; —— Leo X., 8, 27, 57 ; —— Adrian VI., 8, 11–12, 33 ; —— Paul III, 76, 116 ; —— Pius IV., 49, 206 ff, 233, 237, 240

" Porrectio," 171
Preaching and Reformation, 20, 63, 81, 232
Priesthood and Ministry, 63, 108, 110–11 236 ; —— of Laity, 17, 63, 111, 238–9
Principles of the Reformation, Chap. VII.
" Protestant," definition of, 36–8
Purgatory, 165, 235–7

Real Presence, Doctrine of the, 64, 109, 209–10, 215
Reform impossible at Rome, 9, 57, 104, 212, 215
Reformation and Liberty, 13–4, 56–8, 96, 143–6, 218, 241
Reformers not infallible, 21, 46, 228–9
Roman Church's departure from Primitive teaching, 15, 26, 51, 104, 206 ff
Rome against Liberty, 14, 56–8, 114–7, 143–4, 183–7, 215
Royal Supremacy, 154–5, 177, 222
Ridley, Bishop, 179–81, 182–3

Sacraments—see Communion
Sacrifice of Christ, its Perfection, 17, 25, 210–11, 234–5
Sadoleto, Cardinal, 76–7, 99
Servetus, M., 68, 83–6
Statute of Provisors, 10, 145 ; —— Præmunire, 10, 145

Tetzel, Dr. John, 27–9, 51
" Theses," the Ninety-five, 50–2
Transubstantiation, 16, 38, 107–9, 178–81, 237
Tunstall, Bishop, 125–8, 130–1
Tyndale, William : Chap. IV. ; Tyndale's probable birthplace, 118–9 ; —— writings, 132–5 ; —— martrydom, 136–9 ; Tyndale, Estimates of, 139–41

Wolsey, Cardinal, 128, 130, 157
Worship in Reformed Churches, 17, 59–61, 81, 97–99, 204

GOLDEN GATE SEMINARY LIBR

DATE DUE

Demco, Inc. 38-293

27814

School of Urban Missions